DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 356 836 JC 930 244

AUTHOR	Lee, Beth S.; And Others
TITLE	Limiting Access by Degrees: Student Profiles Pre and Post the Fees.
INSTITUTION	Los Rios Community Coll. District, Sacramento, CA. Office of Planning and Research.
PUB DATE	Apr 93
NOTE	87p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Access to Education; Bachelors Degrees; Community Colleges; *Economic Impact; Educational Economics; Educational Finance; Educational Legislation; *Enrollment Trends; *Fees; *Instructional Student Costs; Paying for College; Self Supporting Students; Student Characteristics; Student Educational Objectives; *Tuition; Two Year Colleges; Two Year College Students
IDENTIFIERS	California; Los Rios Community College District CA

ABSTRACT

A study was performed at the Los Rios Community College District (LRCCD), in California, to measure changes in enrollment and educational access due to a 67% increase in statewide community college fees and a $40-per-unit "differential fee" for students already holding a bachelor's degree or higher (BA+). The study was divided into four parts: a survey of 4,009 fall 1992 BA+ students asking them about the potential effects of the new fees on their educational plans, an analysis of these students' course-taking patterns and demographics, an analysis of the entire LRCCD student population before and after the changes, and an analysis of students who continued and those who did not in the years before and after the fees. Results of the study, based on responses from 37% of the BA+ students (n=1,475), included the following: (1) almost 60% of the BA+ students were attending for job-related reasons, while 26% were enrolled for personal development; (2) more than half (55%) were employed full-time, while 19% were employed part-time; (3) 65% said that their employers provided no financial assistance toward their educational expenses; (4) only 12% believed that they would be eligible for one of the fee exemption categories; (5) BA+ student enrollment dropped by 47.3% between spring 1992 and spring 1993, compared to a decrease of 7.9% for the district overall; (6) an analysis of fall-to-spring enrollment for the first year after the new fees revealed that the number of new/returning students declined by 14.6% from pre-fee years; and (7) the largest decreases were for older, part-time, working adult students. Data for similar surveys performed by other colleges in the district, comments by individual respondents, and the survey instrument are included. (MAB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED356836

LIMITING ACCESS BY DEGREES: STUDENT PROFILES PRE AND POST THE FEES

Beth S. Lee, Ed.D.
Janis Cox Jones
Brad Brazil
Verna Puglisi

April 1993

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. S. Lee

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Los Rios Community College District
Office of Planning and Research
1919 Spanos Court
Sacramento, California
95825-3981

JC 930244

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SACRAMENTO CITY COLLEGE · AMERICAN RIVER COLLEGE · COSUMNES RIVER COLLEGE

LIMITING ACCESS BY DEGREES: STUDENT PROFILES PRE AND POST THE FEES

Executive Summary

In August 1992 the California Legislature increased fees for all California community college students by 67% (from $6 to $10 per unit), imposed an additional "differential fee" of $40 per unit for students already holding a bachelor's degree or higher (making their increase 733%), and removed the "cap" which had previously held total fees per semester to a maximum of $60. To provide information needed by the district and its colleges to plan for the future, the Los Rios Community College District Office of Planning and Research (OP&R) undertook a series of research activities to determine the effect of the fees on district enrollments (all students and "BA+" students). This report summarizes the results of these various activities and suggests some policy implications which warrant consideration.

BA+ Survey and Study

- Computer records identified 4,009 BA+ students in Fall 1992 (8.3% of the district's 48,137 total enrollment). These students were surveyed by mail to elicit information about their educational goals, employment status, enrollment patterns, household income, possible eligibility for one of the state-defined exemption categories, and plans for future enrollment.

- Responses were received from 1,475 students (37% of those surveyed). The respondents included more women, older and white students than in the survey population; thus, survey results could not be considered representative of all BA+ students in Los Rios. Survey highlights include the following:

  - Almost 60% were attending for job-related reasons; 74% were employed either full-time or part-time; and 11% were unemployed and seeking work.

  - Nearly 72% were taking fewer than six units; 63% were attending only in the evenings.

  - Almost two-thirds had received their bachelor's degree from the CSU or UC systems, but fully one-third had graduated from a private or out-of-state institution.

  - Only 10% were partially or fully reimbursed for their educational expenses by their employer, and only 12% thought they would qualify for an exemption from the differential fee.

  - 23% reported household incomes of under $20,000; 36% had $20,000-$39,999; and 36% had incomes of $40,000 or over.

BOARD of TRUSTEES

ANN BLACKWOOD NANCY DAVENPORT FRED DAWKINS CLAUDE FARINHA PENNY KASTANIS DAVID MARTY BRUCE POMER

1919 SPANOS COURT • SACRAMENTO, CA 95825-3981 • 916-568-3021

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- Almost half of the respondents said they did not plan to reenroll in Spring 1993, the great majority (65%) because they felt the new fees would make college too expensive.

- Almost half of the respondents added individual comments. Most cited the fact that their BA degrees were outdated or did not prepare them for the current job market; many were taking classes to maintain license/certification requirements; others mentioned the value of lifelong education.

BA+ Enrollments and Course-taking Patterns, Fall 1992 and Spring 1993

- In Fall 1992, 4,009 Los Rios BA+ students were enrolled in a total of 6,557 courses (a student can enroll in more than one course, and at more than one college). In Spring 1993, 2,413 BA+ students were enrolled in 4,001 courses (a 40% decline in students; a 39% decline in the number of courses they took).

- Of the "top ten" departments in terms of BA+ student enrollments in Fall '92, eight showed enrollment losses substantially greater than the overall 39% decline. Hardest hit were real estate, PE/recreation, and Spanish (declines of 50% or more); others included computer information science, mathematics, English, accounting and art. Enrollments in biology and chemistry declined by only around 9%, and physics joined the "top ten" in Spring 1993.

Student Profiles (All Students/BA+ Students) Pre and Post the Fees

For this analysis, Spring 1992-to-Spring 1993 data were used to conform to the time frame used for a statewide Fee Impact Study sponsored by the CCC Chancellor's Office, in which Los Rios was participating. Highlights of these comparisons include the following:

- Districtwide enrollment declined by 8% and BA+ enrollments dropped 47% in Spring 1993 compared to Spring 1992. (One year earlier--Spring 1992 compared to Spring 1991--district enrollment had increased by 4%.) Stated another way, 56% of the district's spring-to-spring enrollment decline was due to the loss of BA+ students.

- The proportions of men and women districtwide remained exactly the same for the two Spring semesters (56% women, 44% men). The proportion of women among BA+ students was slightly higher (58%) in 1992 and even higher (62%) in 1993.

- Overall, the district lost proportionately more Caucasian (-12%) and African American (-10%) students than any other ethnic group between Spring 1992 and Spring 1993. Among BA+ students, losses were proportionately greater among African Americans, Latinos and American Indians, while the decline in Caucasians mirrored the overall decline in BA+ students.

- Overall, the district lost proportionately more older than younger students; in fact, the percentage decline increased consistently with each age group. For BA+ students, no clear pattern emerged with respect to age groups.

- There was a distinct shift from evening to day courses, and from lighter to heavier unit loads, among all students as well as BA+ students; however, almost 78% of BA+ students were still taking fewer than six units in Spring 1993.

- For all students as well as BA+ students, the proportions enrolled for vocational reasons dropped sharply, those with transfer goals declined somewhat, and those enrolling with "no degree or occupational objective" increased substantially in 1993 compared to 1992. A slight distinction appeared among BA+ students: those with specific occupational degree or certificate goals increased slightly, while those taking courses simply to acquire or upgrade job skills decreased substantially.

- With respect to enrollment status, Spring 1993 saw an increase in the number and proportion of students who were "new, never attended college before." The number of continuing students remained stable, but there were substantial declines among returning students and those who were transferring to Los Rios after attending a four-year school. Among BA+ students, the proportion of continuing students increased sharply (although actual numbers declined) while the proportions of new and returning students dropped by 61%.

Who Stayed/Who Left/New and Returning Students (1991-92 and 1992-93)

To gain a different perspective on the impact of fees on enrollment, full-year statistics were analyzed to determine the proportions of students who Stayed (continued from one Fall semester to the following Spring semester); Left (attended in Fall but not in the following Spring); or New (transfers to Los Rios from other schools) or Returning Students (reenrolled in Spring but had not attended the previous Fall). These three cohorts were identified for Fall 1991-Spring 1992 (the pre-fees base year) and for Fall 1992-Spring 1993 (post fees).

- The greatest change between the two years occurred not with those who Stayed, nor with those who Left, but with the tremendous decline in the number of New/Returning Students in Spring 1993 compared to Spring 1992.

  - The cohort who Stayed declined by only 819 students (3%); the cohort who Left rose by only 287 students (1%); while the cohort who came as New/Returning Students declined by 3,057 students (15%) in Spring 1993 compared to Spring 1992.

  - Total enrollment in any Spring semester includes students continuing from the previous Fall plus New/Returning Students in the Spring. Comparing Spring 1993 to Spring 1992, *79% of the net loss was due to the decline in New/Returning Students*, and only 21% was due to the drop in the number who Stayed from the previous semester.

  - Changes in student demographic and enrollment characteristics of these cohorts confirmed trends already discussed in this report.

The Income Question

Data on Los Rios students' household income are suggestive at best, since the new application for admission form which includes an income question has only been in use quite recently.

- In Spring 1992 very few students had completed the new form; by Fall 1992 about a third had, and by Spring 1993 about half had. Of those who completed the new form, about 80% provided income information. Thus the available income data represent responses from approximately 31% of the district's total enrollment in Fall 1992 and 46% in Spring 1993.

- In Fall 1992 around 21% reported household incomes of less than $10,000; 22% had $10,000 to $24,999; 16%, $25,000 to $39,999; 21%, $40,000 or more; and 20% checked "declined to state." In Spring 1993, comparable percentages were 23% under $10,000; 23% from $10,000 to $24,999; 15.5% from $25,000 to $39,999; 20%, $40,000 or more; and 19% "declined to state." It would appear that Los Rios had a larger proportion of lower income students in Spring 1993, after the imposition of fees.

- Further analysis of the student income data revealed that all ethnic minority groups responded to the income question in proportions greater than their respective proportions in the total district population. Since 1990 Federal census statistics indicated that ethnic minority groups in the Sacramento region generally had lower incomes than whites, the household incomes for all Los Rios students might actually be somewhat higher than the above figures indicate.

Policy Implications

For many years, California prided itself on its high-quality public higher education system that was essentially "tuition free." In the late 1980s a modest fee was imposed (and later increased); in 1992 the California Legislature enacted a drastic 67% increase (from $6 to $10 per unit) in fees for all students, plus an additional "differential fee" of $40 per unit for students holding BA degrees or higher, and removed the "cap" or maximum per semester.

The debates regarding fees for higher education took place with little or no actual background data on student income levels and other relevant factors. This report, among others, seeks to fill that policy void. Other policy bodies now addressing this issue include CPEC, the Assembly Higher Education Committee, the Legislative Analyst, and the CCC Chancellor's Office in cooperation with The RP (Research and Planning) Group. If all these policy bodies come together, educational policy analysis may yet inform--or at least enhance--the fees debate.

The Limits to Access

What is known of the impact of fees thus far? In Los Rios, BA+ enrollments declined by almost half and total enrollments fell by 8% from Spring 1992 to Spring 1993; statewide the decline was almost 10%. Most of the BA+ students in Spring '92 enrolled for occupational reasons; of those who enrolled in Spring '93, many fewer came for job-related reasons.

Overall, we lost proportionately more white students than any other ethnic group; more older than younger students; more evening than day students; and more part-time than full-time students. *In short, we lost the older, part-time, working adult students--the kind of students who have accounted for the majority of the growth in community college enrollment over the last two decades.*

As we moved from being the junior colleges of the 1960s to the community colleges of the 1990s we have provided lifelong retraining, reentry and related learning opportunities focused on keeping California's adult population employable and employed. Given California's current economic situation, this is still important.

If the shifts in student profile evidenced in Los Rios are true statewide, we may be observing a legislatively mandated shift back to being junior, rather than community, colleges. If this is in fact the legislative intent, is should be discussed in planning and policy circles rather than simply being allowed to happen as an unintended result of budgetary compromises.

LIMITING ACCESS BY DEGREES: STUDENT PROFILES PRE AND POST THE FEES

Beth S. Lee, Ed.D.
Janis Cox Jones
Brad Brazil
Verna Puglisi

April 1993

Los Rios Community College District
Office of Planning and Research
1919 Spanos Court
Sacramento, California
95825-3981

LIMITING ACCESS BY DEGREES: STUDENT PROFILES PRE AND POST THE FEES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

BACCALAUREATE STUDENT SURVEY AND STUDY 1
- Background 1
- The BA+ Student Survey Results 2
- BA+ Student Comments 4
- Fall 1992-Spring 1993 Course-Taking Patterns 4

STUDENT PROFILES (PRE AND POST THE FEES) 6
- Background 6
- Spring 1992/Spring 1993 Demographic Comparisons 6
- Enrollment 7
- Gender 7
- Ethnicity 8
- Age Groups 8
- Day/Evening Attendance 9
- Unit Load 10
- Educational Goal 10
- Enrollment Status 11
- Who Stayed/Who Left/New and Returning Students 12
- The Income Question 13

POLICY IMPLICATIONS 16
- "That Was Then; This Is Now" 16
- The Limits to Access 17
- Enrollment Implications 18

APPENDICES
- General/District
- American River College
- Cosumnes River College
- Cosumnes River College/Placerville
- Sacramento City College

LIMITING ACCESS BY DEGREES: STUDENT PROFILES PRE AND POST THE FEES

INTRODUCTION

When the California Legislature finally passed a budget measure in August 1992, one of its most startling features was a 67% increase in tuition fees for community college students (from $6 per unit to $10 per unit), plus an additional $40-per-unit "differential fee" for students already holding a bachelor's degree or higher, effective for the Spring 1993 semester. Perhaps even more drastic was the removal of the "cap" so that students would be charged the same for every unit, with no upper limit (previously, students were charged a maximum of $60 for ten or more units).

Across the state, districts faced an uncertain future: what would be the effect of the new fees? Would enrollments drop precipitously? In what areas of the curriculum? Would the baccalaureate students disappear, faced as they were with a 733% increase in their fees? What about the rest of the students: would $10 per unit be a barrier to many, or would they absorb the new fees and return after the initial "sticker shock"? Would the new fees result in enrollment losses, in different types of students coming, or in better persistence?

In order to help understand and plan for the changes anticipated due to the new fees, the Los Rios District's Office of Planning and Research (OP&R) began what would become a four-part study of the effects of the new fees: a survey of the Fall 1992 baccalaureate students to ask them about the potential effects of the new fees on their educational plans; an analysis of the baccalaureate students' course-taking patterns and demographics; an analysis of the entire Los Rios student population and its profile pre and post the fees; and an analysis of who continued and who did not in the years before and after the new fees. The sections which follow address and answer the questions of how we are limiting access by degrees, and look at our colleges' student profiles pre and post the fees.

BACCALAUREATE STUDENT SURVEY AND STUDY

Background

Faced with the reality of a new $40-per-unit differential fee for baccalaureate and higher degree-holding students attending community colleges--and with the imposition of that fee mid-year--the district began to assess the potential results. Since such sharp fee increases could affect enrollments and class offerings already scheduled for Spring 1993, the Los Rios district wanted to know the answers to several key questions about its baccalaureate students:

1. How many current students (Fall 1992) already held bachelor's or higher degrees, and what proportion of the districtwide enrollment did they represent?

2. What courses were these students enrolled in? How many units were they taking?

3. What were their demographic characteristics and what were their reasons for enrolling?

4. Did they plan to reenroll in Spring 1993, when their fees would increase to $50 per unit?

5. Were they eligible for one of the exemption categories for which the differential fee could be waived?

6. What were the income levels of these students?

7. Did the answers to these questions differ by college?

The answer to the first question was easy to obtain: computer records showed that 4,009 Fall 1992 Los Rios students had indicated on their application for admission that they held a bachelor's degree or higher, and that these 4,009 represented 8.3% of the district's total enrollment of 48,137.

To answer the remaining questions, the OP&R staff gathered data from two sources: a survey mailed to the students themselves, and an analysis of the baccalaureate students' course-taking patterns using information on the district's mainframe computer. (Note: The OP&R also prepared an analysis of Fall 1992-Spring 1993 student demographics and other characteristics; however, because Los Rios later agreed to participate in a multidistrict project sponsored by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's office using spring-to-spring data, the fall-spring material is not included here. The spring-to-spring comparisons are described later in this report.)

The following paragraphs discuss various findings using districtwide data; detailed summaries of the survey responses and the computer analyses were prepared for each of the district's three colleges and the Placerville Center, as well as for the district as a whole, and are included in the Appendix.

The BA+ Student Survey Results

The Los Rios Office of Planning and Research developed a questionnaire to be sent to the 4,009 Fall 1992 "BA+" students to elicit information about their plans for the Spring 1993 semester and their reactions to the new fees. The fact that Los Rios was planning a survey to address the BA+ differential fee issue became known very quickly, and OP&R responded to several requests to share its draft questionnaire with other community college districts. Chabot College, among others, surveyed their BA+ students using many of the same questionnaire items as Los Rios, and acknowledged Los Rios' assistance when presenting their findings at a statewide research conference in March 1993. This intercollegiate cooperation has the advantage of providing "comparable data" on issues of mutual interest, making each set of findings more useful than either alone.

The final version of Los Rios' questionnaire included items on the student's educational goal, major program of study, employment status, number of units enrolled in for the Fall 1992 semester, day/evening attendance pattern, location(s) of classes (i.e., main campus/outreach center, etc.), and type of college or university that had granted the baccalaureate degree. There were also items on finances: employer reimbursement of educational expenses (if any), annual household income, and possible eligibility for one of the state-defined exemption categories for which the $40-per-unit "differential" fee could be waived. The last question asked whether the student planned to reenroll in a Los Rios college in Spring 1993, and if not, why not. Space was also provided for students to add comments of their own.

The questionnaire was mailed with a cover letter signed by the district's Chancellor explaining the new fees and a sheet defining each of the exemption categories: dislocated worker, displaced homemaker, student on public assistance (AFDC, SSI, etc.), and student paying nonresident tuition. First class mail was used, and a preaddressed postage-paid envelope was included.

Responses were received from 1,475 students (an overall response rate of 37%). The respondent population did vary from the survey population, with more women, older and white students among the respondents as compared to the total survey population, and therefore could not be considered representative of the entire BA+ student population. In terms of demographics, 76% of the respondents were over 30 years old, 65% were women, and 23% were ethnic minorities.

Copies of the questionnaire showing survey results for each Los Rios college are included in the Appendix of this report; highlights of the survey results for the district as a whole include the following:

- Almost 60% of the BA+ students were attending for job-related reasons; 9% were earning transfer units toward a different degree; and 26% were enrolled for personal development.

- More than half (55%) were employed full-time and 19% part-time.

- Surprisingly, 11% were unemployed and seeking work, higher than the unemployment percentage statewide or in the Sacramento region at the time of the survey.

- Almost 72% were taking fewer than 6 units, and 63% were attending only during the evenings.

- Almost half (47%) of these students received their baccalaureate degrees from the CSU system and 17% from the UC system. Fully a third (34%) received their degrees from either independent (private) or out-of-state institutions.

- Two out of three (65%) said their employer provided no financial assistance toward their educational expenses, and only 10% were partially or fully reimbursed.

- In terms of annual household income, 23% of the baccalaureate students reported less than $20,000; in fact, 8% had an annual income of under $10,000. Over 35% reported between $20,000 and $40,000, and 36% $40,000 or more.

- Relatively few (12%) of the students believed they might be eligible for one of the fee exemption categories (6% as dislocated workers, 3% on public assistance, 2% as displaced homemakers, and 1% already paying nonresident tuition).

- Almost half of the students (48%) stated they would not return to a Los Rios college in Spring 1992, the great majority (65%) because they felt the new fees would make college too expensive.

BA+ Student Comments

The survey form provided space for students to write in their own comments, and 666 students (45% of the 1,475 respondents) did so. While approximately 60% of all respondents had indicated they were attending a Los Rios college for job-related reasons, almost two-thirds of all the comments were from students who had enrolled for those reasons. Many cited the fact that their BA degrees were outdated or did not prepare them for the job market; many who were employed stated they needed the community college classes to upgrade their skills in their present careers or to maintain license/certification requirements; still others were taking classes that while not required to keep their jobs would nonetheless enhance their ability to perform (e.g., classes in Spanish or sign language to permit better communication with clients or students).

Students whose immediate educational goals were less specifically related to employment still had compelling reasons for attending: some were taking classes that would apply toward a second bachelor's degree that might lead to a better career (including some foreign students whose degrees were not "acknowledged" for relevant employment in this country); a few were trying to improve their basic skills in English, reading or mathematics; and a substantial number mentioned the value of continuing education for lifelong learning and enrichment.

While the student comments are difficult to condense or quantify for the body of this report, their variety and intensity merit more complete consideration. A more complete summary, entitled *BA+ Students Speak Out!* is included in the Appendix.

Fall 1992-Spring 1993 Course-Taking Patterns

To assist the colleges in planning their Spring 1993 semester course offerings, OP&R did an analysis of the BA+ students' course-taking patterns in Fall 1992. This analysis required combining information from two computer files--the Fall 1992 Student Master File (containing information from the district's application for admission) and the Transcript File (containing information on courses, grades, etc.)--using the OP&R Student Performance Data Base (SPDB) and SPSS computer software. A separate analysis was done for each college and the Placerville Center, as well as for the district as a whole. The analysis was conducted soon after the Fall

1992 Fourth Week Census and the information was provided to the college vice presidents of instruction for use in choosing classes to add to or delete from the Spring 1993 schedule. A similar analysis was conducted in Spring 1993, and some highlights for the two semesters are discussed below.

Compared to the 4,009 BA+ students attending Los Rios colleges in Fall 1992, only 2,413 BA+ students enrolled in Spring 1993--a drop of almost 40%. The drop in individual course enrollments was similar: the 4,009 Fall semester students took a total of 6,557 courses (one student can enroll in more than one course, and at more than one college); the 2,413 students in Spring 1993 took 4,011 courses. Thus the net number of BA+ degree students decreased by 1,596 (-39.8%) from Fall 1992 to Spring 1993, and the number of courses they took fell from 6,557 to 4,011 (-38.8%).

The summary below shows the "top ten/eleven" departments in terms of BA+ student enrollments throughout the district in Fall 1992 and Spring 1993. Percentages for each semester are of all BA+ course enrollments that semester; the last two columns show the net "loss" in individual enrollments, followed by the percentage loss compared to the previous semester. Departments are listed in order of percentage loss in Spring 1993. (Summaries by college are included in the Appendix.) It is interesting to note that while the Fall 1992 "top ten" list remained essentially the same in Spring 1993 (physics replaced real estate), each of these departments--with the exception of the hard sciences--lost from 52% to 43% in BA+ student enrollments, compared to the 40% overall decline in BA+ students.

Department	Fall 1992		Spring 1993		Loss in Enrollments	% Loss From Fall 1992
Total BA+ Course Enrollments	**6,557**	**100%**	**4,011**	**100%**	**-2546**	**-38.8%**
▸ Real Estate (not in S93 Top 10)	213	3.2%	97	2.4%	- 116	-54.5%
▸ PE/Recreation	477	7.3%	231	5.8%	- 246	-51.6%
▸ Spanish	269	4.1%	135	3.4%	- 134	-49.8%
▸ Computer Info Science	466	7.1%	247	6.2%	- 219	-47.0%
▸ Mathematics	230	3.5%	123	3.1%	- 107	-46.5%
▸ English	182	2.8%	99	2.5%	- 83	-45.6%
▸ Accounting	272	4.1%	152	3.8%	- 120	-44.1%
▸ Art	357	5.4%	203	5.1%	- 154	-43.1%
▸ Biology	404	6.2%	366	9.1%	- 38	- 9.4%
▸ Chemistry	250	3.8%	228	5.7%	- 22	- 8.8%
▸ Physics (not in F92 Top 10)	-	-	104	2.6%	-	-

While the "top ten" areas accounted for around 50% of all BA+ student enrollments in each semester, the BA+ students were enrolled in virtually all areas of the curriculum, with no other area accounting for more than 3% of the total.

STUDENT PROFILES (PRE AND POST THE FEES)

Background

The foregoing analysis of BA+ students' demographics and course-taking patterns was prompted by the furor over the $40-per-unit differential fee imposed by the 1992 California Legislature (to take effect in Spring 1993) on students already holding baccalaureate or higher degrees. Los Rios was one of the first districts to undertake this type of analysis, which was done primarily to provide data that would be helpful in planning for the Spring 1993 semester. OP&R also drafted a summary of demographic and other characteristics of all students enrolled in Fall 1992 for purposes of comparison to the BA+ students.

Preliminary data from these analyses were shared with other California community college researchers at the Annual Conference of the statewide RP (Research and Planning) Group at Granlibakken in March 1993. At that conference, a comparison of Los Rios data with that from other districts revealed that results were remarkably similar in several other districts throughout the state. Discussions among the researchers also addressed the fact that while the "differential" fee of $40 per unit had been imposed only on baccalaureate degree students, fees for all community college students had been increased by 67% (from $6 per unit to $10 per unit), and the "cap" which had held fees to a maximum of $60 per semester had been removed, effective for the Spring 1993 semester. The overall effect of these changes would require analyses of student profiles for all students, not just those with baccalaureate degrees.

Los Rios then agreed to cooperate with The RP Group and the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Research and Analysis Unit in a Fee Impact Study which would, among other things, compare data from Spring 1992 and Spring 1993 on two populations: "all students" and "BA+ students." It was felt that a spring-to-spring comparison would be more valid than the fall-to-spring analysis already done by Los Rios and others because historically spring semester student populations tended to differ from fall populations in a number of ways.

Spring 1992/Spring 1993 Demographic Comparisons

The following paragraphs discuss highlights of the Spring 1992-to-Spring 1993 comparisons of various demographic and other characteristics of *all Los Rios students* (including any notable differences by college), followed by comparable data on *all BA+ students* for the same semesters. These comments are based on detailed charts developed by OP&R which show (for each characteristic) numbers of students and percentages of students for each semester, net changes in numbers, and spring-to-spring percentage changes, for all students and for BA+ students, for the district and for each college. Copies of these detailed charts are included in the Appendix of this report. In considering the percentage changes discussed below, it should be kept in mind that when the total numbers in a category are small, slight changes in numbers may result in relatively large percentage increases or decreases.

Enrollment

All Students

District enrollment fell from 49,267 in Spring 1992 to 45,391 in Spring 1993, a decrease of 3,876 or 7.9% This is in stark contrast to comparable figures for the same time frame one year earlier (Spring 1991 to Spring 1992), when enrollment *increased* by 1,973 or 4.2% (from 47,294 to 49,267).

All the district's colleges experienced drops in enrollment, but the percentage decreases varied considerably: ARC declined 10.8% from the previous Spring semester; CRC, 4.1%; CRC/Placerville, 14.6%; and SCC, 5.3%.

BA+ Students

BA+ student enrollments experienced a much sharper decline (47.3%) than the 7.9% overall enrollment decline: in Spring 1993 there were only 2,413 BA+ students in the district (5.3% of the 45,391 total enrollment), compared to 4,577 in Spring 1992 (9.3% of the 49,267 total enrollment). Stated another way, 56% of the district's spring-to-spring enrollment decline of 3,876 was due to the loss of 2,164 BA+ students.

Gender

All Students

The proportions of men and women districtwide remained exactly the same for the two Spring semesters (56% women, 44% men).

These proportions differed among the colleges (ARC had 55% women; CRC, 57%; CRC/P, 65%; and SCC, 56%), and changes in the proportions at each college varied somewhat: from Spring 1992 to Spring 1993 ARC lost proportionately more women than men; CRC lost proportionately more men than women; and at SCC and CRC/P the declines for each gender were approximately the same as the overall declines for each campus.

BA+ Students

Compared to the district's total enrollment in Spring 1992, BA+ students included a somewhat larger proportion of women (58%) than men (42%). The number of men declined 52% in the following year, compared to declines of 44% for women and 47% for all BA+ students, making the BA+ ratio 62% female and 38% male by Spring 1993.

Ethnicity

All Students

The Los Rios district lost proportionately more Caucasian students than any other ethnic group between Spring 1992 and Spring 1993: the number decreased by 3,549 (a 12% drop), and their percentage of overall enrollment declined from 61.5% to 58.9%. African American and American Indian student enrollments dropped 9.7% and 8.3% respectively (more than the districtwide average decrease of 7.9%), but their proportions within total enrollments remained essentially the same. Latinos showed a slight decrease numerically but increased their proportion within the total district enrollment (from 9.9% to 10.4%), while Filipinos and those checking "other" increased in both numbers and proportions (percentage increases were 2.5% for Filipinos and 20% for "other"). The number of Asians, still the district's largest ethnic minority group, decreased by four students, while their proportion of total enrollment increased from 10.6% to 11.5%.

At the district's three colleges, shifts in proportions of various ethnic groups generally reflected those of the district as a whole, although there were some variations. Every college lost proportionately more Caucasians than any other ethnic group (compared to the respective college's overall enrollment decline), and Filipinos increased slightly in both numbers and proportions at every college. African American enrollments dropped substantially at CRC and slightly at SCC, but less than the college's overall decline at ARC, while the number of American Indian students declined at ARC and SCC and remained fairly constant at CRC. Enrollments of Asian students dropped less than each college's overall decline at ARC and SCC and actually increased by 12% at CRC; Latinos increased their proportions at each college and actually increased numerically at SCC; and the proportion who checked "other" ethnicity increased sharply at all three colleges. (At CRC Placerville, the total number of all ethnic minority students combined decreased by four students, but the relatively small numbers for each ethnic group make year-to-year percentage changes less useful.)

BA+ Students

Compared to the 47% overall decline in BA+ students, the district lost proportionately more African American, Latino and American Indian students (59%, 57% and 53%, respectively), while Asians, Filipinos, and "other" ethnic groups had proportionately smaller declines (44%, 29% and 36%, respectively). The 47.5% decline in Caucasian BA+ students mirrored the overall decline in BA+ students.

Age Groups

All Students

Analysis of the age group proportions indicates that from Spring 1992 to Spring 1993 the district lost proportionately more older students than younger students: the number of students 30 years

old and older decreased by 12.5%, while those between 18 and 24 declined less than 5%, compared to the overall 7.9% decrease in total BA+ enrollments. In fact, the percentage decline increased consistently with each older age group.

At each of the colleges, the decline among students 30 or older was substantially greater than the college's overall decline. Other age groups varied somewhat: at ARC, CRC, and CRC/P, the percentage loss in the 25-to-29 age group far exceeded each college's overall decline, while at SCC there was virtually no change in this age group. The greatest loss of 30-or-older students was at CRC/P, which historically has had the largest proportion of older students (down 22% compared to the overall campus decline of 14.6%). Losses were proportionately smaller among the younger age groups; at CRC, enrollments of students age 24 and younger actually *increased* in both numbers and proportions while total college enrollment dropped by 4%.

BA+ Students

This pattern of "greatest loss among oldest students" did not hold true for BA+ students districtwide: their strongest decline was in students age 21 to 24 (64%, compared to a 47% decline for all BA+ students). The decline among students 30 to 39 years old (49%) was also slightly above the overall drop; however, declines in the 25-to-29 and 40+ age groups were slightly less than the 47% overall.

Day/Evening Attendance

All Students

A comparison of attendance patterns in the two semesters reveals a distinct shift from evening to day classes: attendance in "evening only" classes dropped by 14.5% (compared to a 7.9% drop in total students), while attendance in "day only" classes dropped by only 4.5%. The proportion taking a combination of day and evening courses dropped even less (2.2%). This shift toward day classes was also apparent at all three colleges and at the Placerville Center; in fact, at both CRC and CRC/P the number of "day only" students actually increased while overall enrollment dropped.

BA+ Students

Changes in attendance patterns among BA+ students paralleled those for all students: the proportion of students taking "evening only" classes dropped 53%, compared to the overall decline of 47% among BA+ students, while the proportion taking "day only" classes declined only 34%. It should be kept in mind, however, that even with these changes only 33% of the BA+ students were attending "day only" classes in Spring 1993; 58% still attended only in the evening, and 9% had a combination schedule.

Unit Load

All Students

A definite shift can also be seen in the percentage decline of full-time students (2.5%) compared to that for part-time students (9.4%), again compared to the 7.9% decline in overall enrollment. Among part-time students, those taking a "light load" (5.5 units or fewer) decreased by almost 12% from Spring 1992 to Spring 1993, while students taking a "mid load" declined by 6%. The move toward heavier unit loads was evident at all of the district's colleges, with CRC and CRC/P showing actual increases in both the numbers and proportions of full-time students in spite of decreases in total enrollments.

BA+ Students

Enrollment patterns of BA+ students also showed a shift from lighter to heavier unit loads, but 77.5% were still taking a "light load" of 5.5 or fewer units in Spring 1993; 3.5% were full-time students, and 19% were taking a "mid load" of 6 to 11.5% units.

Educational Goal

All Students

A comparison of students' educational goals in Spring 1992 with those in Spring 1993 leads to a surprising conclusion: the proportions of those who enrolled for vocational reasons dropped sharply, those preparing to transfer dropped slightly, while the proportion of those who enrolled with "no degree or occupational objective" *increased substantially*.

When asked to check their "most important educational goal" on the application for admission form, 24% of all Spring 1992 students had checked one of the four career-related goals (vocational degree, vocational certificate, acquire job skills, or upgrade job skills); 60% indicated they had enrolled to prepare to transfer to a four-year college; and 12% cited "no degree or occupational objective." In Spring 1993, only 19% were pursuing vocational goals, 57% sought university transfer, and the proportion who had no degree or occupational objective had increased to 21%. Computed on the basis of numbers of students involved, these shifts represent *a decline* of 27% in students with vocational goals (and all four sub-goals had sharp declines); a 12% *decline* in students with transfer goals; and a 63% *increase* in the number of students with "no degree or occupational objective," compared to a 7.9% decrease in total enrollment.

For each of the district's colleges, the same shifts were apparent: percentage decreases in vocational goals far exceeded each college's overall decline; percentage drops among those seeking transfer also exceeded the overall declines, but were less pronounced; while those declaring "no degree or occupational objective" showed substantial increases in both numbers and proportions. For more specific data on these and other changes, see detailed charts in the Appendix.

BA+ Students

Shifts in educational goals also occurred among the BA+ students, but there were some important differences. It should first be noted that the proportions of BA+ students in the various goal categories were quite different from those for all students: in Spring 1992 *more than half* (51%) of the BA+ students were attending for vocational reasons; not surprisingly, only 13% planned to transfer to a four-year school; and 35% had enrolled with "no degree or occupational objective." In Spring 1993 the proportion with vocational goals had *decreased sharply* to 42%; those seeking transfer remained the same at 13%; and the proportion with "no degree or occupational objective" had *increased* to 44%. Based on numbers of students, these changes represented percentage declines of 56% for all vocational goals combined, 49% for those planning to transfer, and 33% for those with "no goal," compared to the 47% overall decline in BA+ students.

When "vocational" and "transfer" goals are aggregated as in the above analysis, trends among BA+ students seem to parallel those of the total district population. However, when the four vocational goals are examined individually, the picture is somewhat different. The proportions of BA+ students who were seeking a specific *vocational degree or vocational certificate* actually *increased* in Spring 1993 while the proportions who enrolled to acquire job skills or upgrade job skills *declined* sharply. A similar phenomenon occurred with the two transfer goals: the proportion of BA+ students who planned to transfer to a four-year institution *without* getting an AA degree *increased*, while the proportion who planned to transfer *after* getting an AA degree *decreased*. (See charts in the Appendix for specific details.)

These same distinctions were true at the district's three colleges, with one minor exception at SCC. At CRC/Placerville, the numbers of BA+ students in each category are too small for meaningful percentage comparisons, but even there the increase in the proportion who enrolled with "no degree or occupational objective" was pronounced (from 58% in Spring 1992 to 72% in Spring 1993).

Enrollment Status

All Students

With respect to enrollment status, Spring 1993 saw a substantial *increase* in both the number and proportion of students who indicated they were "new, never attended college before" (4,191 or 8.5% in Spring 1992 compared to 4,479 or 9.9% in Spring 1993). These gains were remarkable since overall enrollment *declined* 7.9% during the same time period. Spring 1993 also showed an increase in the proportion of "continuing" students, with actual numeric gains at CRC and CRC/P and very small numeric declines at ARC and SCC. On the other hand, the greatest proportional declines occurred among students who had attended a four-year school and were returning to a Los Rios college or were new to Los Rios. There was also a substantial decline in the number and proportion who were returning after an absence without having attended elsewhere.

BA+ Students

Enrollment categories showing the largest percentage changes among BA+ students were similar to those discussed above for all students. The number of "continuing" students showed little change from Spring 1992 to Spring 1993 (a drop of 71 students), but their proportion of total enrollments increased from 42% to 55%. There were sharp drops in the proportions who checked "new, attended four-year school" (from 31% to 22%), "returning, previously in Los Rios" (13% to 7%), and "returning, attended four-year school" (14% to 11%).

Who Stayed/Who Left/New and Returning Students

To gain a different perspective on the impact of increased fees on enrollments and other factors, OP&R conducted yet another computer analysis of available data--a comparison of full-year enrollment statistics for the 1991-92 and 1992-93 academic years. For each year, three cohorts were identified: (1) those who Stayed (attended in the Fall semester and continued on into the Spring semester); (2) those who Left (attended in the Fall semester but did not continue into the Spring); and (3) New/Returning Students (those who enrolled in the Spring semester but had not attended the preceding Fall). Student profiles for each cohort were compared in an effort to detect differences which might be attributed to the increased fees.

An analysis of the fall-to-spring changes in each cohort in 1991-92 (Pre Fees) compared to 1992-93 (Post Fees) leads to the conclusion that the greatest change occurred not with those who Stayed or those who Left, but rather with the *tremendous decline* in the number of New/Returning students in the Post Fees year. Specifically, the number of students who Stayed dropped by only 819 (2.9%); the number who Left increased by only 287 students (1.4%); but the number of New/Returning students in the Post Fees year *declined by 3,057 (14.6%)* compared to the Pre Fees year!

As discussed earlier, total enrollment in the Los Rios district declined 7.9% in Spring 1993 (Post Fees) compared to Spring 1992 (Pre Fees)--a net loss of 3,876 students. Total enrollment in any Spring semester is comprised of students continuing from the previous Fall semester plus new and returning students who did not attend in the previous Fall semester. Comparing Spring 1993 to Spring 1992, 79% of the net loss was due to the decline in New/Returning students, and only 21% was due to the drop in the number who Stayed from the previous Fall semester.

In comparing changes in student profiles for each of the three cohorts, many of the findings regarding various demographic and enrollment characteristics confirmed trends already discussed: losses were proportionately greater for Caucasians, African American and "other" ethnic groups, older students, evening and part-time students, and students with vocational goals. Conversely, while total enrollments declined, the losses were relatively smaller for Asians, Filipinos, younger and full-time students, and students with "no degree or occupational objective." With respect to gender, the cohort that Stayed lost more women, while the cohort of New/Returning lost relatively more men. (Overall, the proportions of females to males remained about the same in the two Spring semesters.) Charts showing details are included in the Appendix.

The Income Question

What was the relationship between household income and a student's decision to pay the increased community college fees? What implications does this have for the future when fees may again be increased substantially? Answers to these and related questions are suggestive at best in the Los Rios district because the new application for admission form which includes an income question has only been in use quite recently. In Spring 1992 very few students had received the new form; by Fall 1992, about a third of the students had completed the new form, and by Spring 1993, about half had (continuing students do not need to complete a new application). Thus the income analyses are based on partial, and not necessarily comparable, student populations. However, given the importance of having income data on students during this crucial period of fee increases and financial aid questions, suggestive information is better than none at all.

Question 22 on the application for admission is worded as follows:

> "HOUSEHOLD INCOME STATISTICS--Indicate the approximate total annual income of your household."

The number and percentage of responses to each option are shown below.

	Fall 1992	Spring 1993
Total students enrolled	48,137	45,391
Number responding to Q22	18,417	25,765
Percent of total enrollment	38.3%	56.8%
Number who gave $ information	14,704	20,812
Percent of all respondents to Q22	79.8%	80.8%
Percent of total enrollment	30.5%	45.9%
Responses to Q22:		
▸ $4,999 or less	10.4%	11.8%
▸ $5,000 - $9,999	10.1%	10.8%
▸ $10,000-$14,999	8.6%	9.1%
▸ $15,000-$19,999	6.3%	6.5%
▸ $20,000-$24,999	7.1%	7.1%
▸ $25,000-$29,999	6.0%	5.6%
▸ $30,000-$34,999	5.7%	5.5%
▸ $35,000-$39,999	4.6%	4.4%
▸ $40,000 or more	21.0%	19.9%
▸ Decline to state	20.2%	19.3%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

As shown on the previous page, the percentage of students who completed the new application form and who responded to the question on household income increased from 38% in Fall 1992 to 57% in Spring 1993. This percentage can be expected to increase in the future as the new application for admission form is used more consistently throughout the district. As can also be seen above, approximately 80% of the students who answered this question actually provided income data (20% checked "decline to state"). Thus the available income data represent responses from approximately 31% of the district's total enrollment in Fall 1992 and 46% in Spring 1993.

In summary, household income available on the data base is as follows:

	Fall 1992	Spring 1993
▸ Less than $10,000	20.5%	22.6%
▸ $10,000-$24,999	22.0%	22.7%
▸ $25,000-$39,999	16.3%	15.5%
▸ $40,000 or more	21.0%	19.9%
▸ Declined to state	20.2%	19.3%

By comparison, the recent California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) SEARS report indicated that "50% of independent community college students (80% of CC students are independent) have household incomes of less than $24,000 per year." Compared to the data above, Los Rios students would appear to have somewhat higher incomes than the statewide average.

Who Answered "The Income Question"?

The figures quoted above would seem to indicate that Los Rios had a *larger* proportion of lower income students in Spring 1993, after the imposition of the new fees! In an effort to explain this surprising finding, OP&R conducted a more detailed analysis of the students who had provided income data on their application for admission. Highlights of this analysis include the following:

- College Attended. Of the 18,417 Fall '92 students who responded to the income question, 18.5% were at ARC, 45% at SCC, 30% at CRC, and 6% at Placerville. Of the 25,765 who provided income data in Spring '93, 31.5% were at ARC, 38% at SCC, 25% at CRC, and 5% at Placerville. The degree to which each college was using the new application form would have strong influence on these proportions.

- Ethnicity. As shown in the breakdown below, ethnic minority students responded to the income question in proportions greater than their proportions in the district population as a whole. This was true for all non-white ethnic groups in each semester. Since 1990 Federal census statistics indicated that ethnic minority

groups in the Sacramento region generally have lower incomes than whites, then Los Rios' students' household incomes might actually be somewhat higher than those shown in the previous section.

	% Responded Fall 1992	% in District Fall 1992	% Responded Spring 1993	% in District Spring 1993
American Indian	2.1%	2.2%	2.2%	2.2%
Asian	12.7%	11.0%	11.7%	11.5%
African American	11.3%	9.4%	10.2%	9.2%
Hispanic	11.5%	10.4%	10.7%	10.4%
Filipino	2.9%	2.4%	2.6%	2.4%
Other	4.8%	3.9%	5.2%	4.4%
Caucasian	54.3%	60.0%	56.3%	58.6%

- Gender. Responses to the income question were very similar for males and females, as shown below. Slightly fewer females, and slightly more males, responded in Spring 1993 than their respective proportions in that semester's population.

	% Responded Fall 1992	% in District Fall 1992	% Responded Spring 1993	% in District Spring 1993
Females	57.7%	57.5%	55.8%	56.2%
Males	42.3%	42.5%	44.2%	43.8%

While these varied data on "The Income Question" provide the basis for further study, they do not provide a definitive answer to the basic question, "To what extent did the fees impact enrollment by income level at a Los Rios college?" What this analysis shows is that the responses to the income question came more frequently from SCC students and from ethnic minority students than would have been the case if all Los Rios students had responded equally. These factors could account for the lower-than-expected incomes, and for the fact that the reported incomes increased after the fees (i.e., more students answered in Spring 1993, resulting in a somewhat better distribution of incomes). Once our new application is in more general use, with the information updated each term, we will be able to better track the changes in income levels with the proposed changes in fees.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

"That Was Then; This Is Now"

For many years, California prided itself on the quality of its public higher education system, and on the fact that the education was "tuition free." The belief was that the state's investment in higher education was in fact an investment in its intellectual and economic future, and the taxpayers of California funded and built a tripartite higher education system that was the envy of many states and even nations. The 1960 Master Plan for California Higher Education codified many of the elements of the system, and clarified the mission and functions of the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges. Indeed, there is no question that California's great investment in its public higher education system contributed to California's technological edge and its robust economic growth throughout the sixties, seventies and into the eighties.

Much has changed since the 1960 Master Plan was written: the student clientele is dramatically different, the institutions are aging, the technological edge is held by Japan, and California's economy is far from robust. Faced with a serious recession, a rising tide of immigration, and social services that are strained beyond the limit, California has been forced to question its ability to continue to provide low-cost higher education to all who want it. Beginning with small increases in student fees in the late 1980s, by 1992 the California Legislature sought to help balance the state's budget through cuts in public higher education that would be made up by increases in student fees.

The fees debate was heated and centered around a key, though rarely articulated, question: to what extent is higher education a private vs. a public benefit, and how much should each party to the benefit pay? When the legislative dust cleared, the result was dramatically higher fees in all three higher education segments, including a 67% increase in tuition (from $6 to $10 per unit) for community college students, plus an additional $40-per-unit "differential fee" for any student already possessing a baccalaureate or higher degree and attending a community college. The "private benefit" argument had triumphed, aided certainly by the state's dismal fiscal situation and the fact that cuts in health and welfare programs (the other major areas of the budget) had already been made. Those attending higher education institutions were seen as a privileged lot, with the sense that they should be charged their "fair share" of the cost of instruction, whatever that might be.

Unfortunately, these debates took place with little or no actual data about student income levels, costs of instruction and services, or student goals or intent. Such studies are only now becoming available. Fiscal necessity became the mother of policy invention.

A number of agencies are now seeking to fill the policy void. The California Postsecondary Education Commission has just published a series of papers covering the financial status of California undergraduates, student fee and financial aid policy alternatives, and options for maximizing access to higher education. CPEC intends to publish a strategic plan by the end of

the year that will address who should be subsidized in higher education, how to fund instruction, and how to structure student fee and financial aid policies (Ad Com, March 1993, ACCCA, p.4). CPEC estimates that the state's fiscal crisis may last up to four years, with four more years needed to recover the recession years' losses. The Assembly Higher Education Committee is conducting another review of higher education, with an eye toward establishing its own priorities for who and what should have priority for higher education funding (Ad Com, Feb. 1993, ACCCA, p.2). In addition, the Legislative Analyst has proposed that the Legislature enact statewide enrollment priorities that "focus on higher-priority students." The Analyst supports the Governor's proposed $30-per-unit fee increase, under which a full-time community college student would pay $900 annually ("Community College Legislative Update," School Services of California, Inc.; Mar. 1, 1993, p.44). If all these policy bodies come together, this year educational policy analysis may inform--or at least enhance--the fees debate.

The Limits to Access

Now that we have faced the initial impact of both the general and the differential fees, what have we learned about the results? In Los Rios, we know that we lost almost half our baccalaureate enrollment compared to the previous spring. We know from our Fall '92 survey that 60% of these students had enrolled for job-related reasons; of those enrolled in Spring '93, many fewer came for job-related reasons. Proportionately more men than women BA+ students left, and the decline was greater for African American, Latino and American Indian BA+ students. The Spring '93 baccalaureate students took a slightly higher unit load and there was a higher proportion of continuing students. In terms of curriculum, the areas hardest hit were Real Estate and PE/Recreation, with the hard sciences holding strong.

Clearly, the legislative intent of limiting baccalaureate student access to the community colleges was achieved with the differential fee. Considering that such students are often the most easily made employable with relatively few classes, turning these students away from our job training opportunities at a time when California desperately needs to improve its employment rate may be a serious mistake. In the words of our BA+ students: "The current administration betrays their own devaluation of education..." and "I'm moving to Idaho--good luck in salvaging the community college system; you'll need it!"

With half the BA+ students gone, what about the rest of the student body? Did the fees affect the total student profile? Decidedly yes. The Los Rios District experienced an 8% drop in total enrollment from Spring '92 to Spring '93. But the changes in the student demographics were startling: we lost, proportionately, more white students than any other ethnic group; more older than younger students; more evening than day students; and more part-time than full-time students. *In short, we lost the older, part-time, working adult students--the kinds of students who have accounted for the majority of the growth in community college enrollments over the last two decades.*

As we have moved from being the junior colleges of the 1960s to the community colleges of the 1990s, we have provided lifelong retraining, reentry and related learning opportunities to adults

throughout our communities. The partnerships with business and industry, the programs to help with reemployment of displaced workers, all focus on making and keeping California's adult population employable and employed. If the shifts in the student profile evidenced in Los Rios are true statewide, we may be observing a legislatively mandated shift back to being junior, rather than community, colleges. If this is in fact the legislative intent, it should be discussed in planning and policy circles, rather than simply being allowed to happen as an unintended result of budgetary compromises.

Enrollment Implications

Statewide, the Chancellor's Office reports that community college enrollment has dropped almost 10% from Spring 1992. Given the recession's high unemployment, with the usual concomitant demand for community college training, the Chancellor's Office estimates that over a million more students would be enrolled currently statewide if not for the increased fees and course cutbacks resulting from budget limitations ("Community College Legislative Update," Mar. 15, 1993, School Services of California, Inc.; pp.62-63). While demographics are not yet available, it is quite possible that the changes in student profiles observed in the Los Rios colleges may also have occurred statewide.

If we are returning to a somewhat younger, more traditional student population, that has implications for our curriculum and support services, as well as for our facilities. For example, in early 1992, we discussed our ideas for our newly proposed and approved Folsom Lake College, which was built around the assumption that the district's burgeoning enrollments would continue, and that the majority of its students would initially be older, part-time, working adults. The possibility that our enrollments districtwide may remain stable or decline for the next several years means that we may want to plan for a somewhat smaller and more traditional student population at Folsom Lake--something which, happily, our flexible, phased design permits. Similar discussions about the impact of the new fees are occurring throughout the district, and will likely continue for some time.

It is clear that even at $10 per unit, our students were more negatively price responsive than we had imagined; at $20 or $30 per unit, the 8% enrollment decline could be repeated or deepened. The consideration of alternative budget scenarios is already underway within the district. In addition, our attention to changes in the student profiles, in course-taking patterns and in student goals will enable us to plan wisely for the future, whatever it may hold.

APPENDIX

General/District

Questionnaire and Responses to BA+ Student Survey—Fall 1992

Cover letter from Chancellor (included in BA+ Student Survey)

Exemptions from Payment of Differential Fees (included in BA+ Student Survey)

BA+ Students Speak Out! (summary of student comments)

Highlights of BA+ Student Survey (Fall 1992)

BA+ Students' Course-Taking Patterns and Demographics (Fall 1992)

BA+ Students' Course-Taking Patterns and Demographics—Spring 1993

Comparison of BA+ Students' Course-Taking Patterns—Fall 1992-Spring 1993

Chart of All Student Characteristics—Spring 1992 & Spring 1993

Chart of BA+ Student Characteristics—Spring 1992 & Spring 1993

Chart of Who Stayed—Spring 1992 & Spring 1993

Chart of Who Left—Spring 1992 & Spring 1993

Chart of New and Returning Students—Spring 1992 & Spring 1993

LOS RIOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

SURVEY OF BACCALAUREATE DEGREE STUDENTS

DISTRICTWIDE FIGURES (N=1,475)

AMERICAN RIVER COLLEGE

COSUMNES RIVER COLLEGE
CRC/PLACERVILLE CENTER

SACRAMENTO CITY COLLEGE

DEAR STUDENT: Your answers to the following questions will help us to schedule courses to meet your needs. (Unless otherwise noted, please check only one response for each item.)

1. What is your MOST IMPORTANT reason for attending our college? (Check only one.)

551	37%	a. To acquire skills for new job/career
273	19%	b. To upgrade skills for present career field
46	3%	c. To maintain certificate or license
12	1%	d. To improve basic skills in English/reading/math
139	9%	e. To earn transferable units for another degree
389	26%	f. For personal interest/educational development
52	4%	g. Other (please describe) (Various)
13	1%	No Response

2. Are you enrolled in an occupational major program?

Yes 430 29% No 1,015 69% NR 30 2%

If Yes, which program? (Check only one.)
(% based on 430 who answered Yes)

74	17%	a. Accounting/Business/Management
4	1%	b. Administration of Justice
4	1%	c. Aviation Maintenance Technology
24	6%	d. Computer Information Science
23	5%	e. Early Childhood Education
9	2%	f. Electronics Technology
15	4%	g. Fire Technology
3	1%	h. Food Service Management
1	.2%	i. Foodservice Production/Control
15	4%	j. Horticulture
32	7%	k. Legal Assisting
5	1%	l. Library Technology
8	2%	m. Mechanical-Electrical Technology
41	10%	n. Nursing (R.N.)
13	3%	o. Occupational Therapy Assistant
4	1%	p. Printing Technology
38	9%	q. Real Estate
21	5%	r. Sign Language Studies
89	21%	s. Other (please specify) (Various)
7	2%	Answered Yes, but did not specify program

3. In what other types of courses are you enrolled? (Check all that apply.) (Each % based on 1,475)

130	9%	a. Art
114	8%	b. Biological Sciences (biology, physiology, etc.)
196	13%	c. Business/Computer Science/Management
30	2%	d. Early Childhood Education
49	3%	e. English/Speech
12	1%	f. English as a Second Language
39	3%	g. Family/Consumer Science, Home Economics
129	9%	h. Foreign Language
81	6%	i. Mathematics/Statistics
54	4%	j. Music
109	7%	k. Physical Education
67	5%	l. Physical Sciences (chemistry, physics, etc.)
95	6%	m. Social/Behavioral Science (econ., psych., etc.)
8	1%	n. Theater Arts
135	9%	o. Other (Please specify) (Various)

4. What is your current employment status?

817	55%	a. Employed full-time
279	19%	b. Employed part-time
3	.2%	c. Full-time military service
166	11%	d. Unemployed but seeking work
190	13%	e. Unemployed, not seeking work
20	1%	No Response

5. How many units are you taking this semester?

62	4%	a. 12 or more units
336	23%	b. 6 to 11.5 units
1056	72%	c. .5 to 5.5 units
21	1%	No Response

6. When are your classes scheduled?

171	12%	a. During the day (mornings and afternoons)
115	8%	b. Mornings only (begin before 12:00)
79	5%	c. Afternoons only (begin 12:00 or later)
931	63%	d. Evenings only (begin 5:00 p.m. or later)
133	9%	e. Both day and evening
31	2%	f. Weekends (only)
15	1%	No Response

[OVER, PLEASE]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

7. Where do you attend classes? (Check all that apply)
(Each % based on 1,475 respondents)

619	42%	a. AMERICAN RIVER COLLEGE (Main Campus)
39	3%	b. Natomas Outreach Center
30	2%	c. Sunrise Outreach Center
13	1%	d. McClellan AFB Outreach Center
3	.2%	e. Kaiser Hospital
2	.1%	f. Gramercy Court
12	1%	g. Sacramento Fire Dept. Towers
0	0%	h. Mission Oaks Senior Center
3	.2%	i. Orange Grove School
223	15%	j. COSUMNES RIVER COLLEGE (Main)
59	4%	k. Placerville Center
32	2%	l. Folsom/Cordova Outreach Sites
13	1%	m. Mather Outreach Center
393	27%	n. SACRAMENTO CITY COLLEGE (Main)
65	4%	o. Davis Center
80	5%	p. Downtown Center
25	2%	q. West Sacramento Center

8. Please indicate the type of college/university which granted your bachelor's degree:

251	17%	a. University of California
693	47%	b. California State University
96	7%	c. California Independent University
248	17%	d. Out-of-state Public University
146	10%	e. Out-of-state Private University
41	3%	No Response

9. Are your educational expenses offset or reimbursed by your employer?

58	4%	a. Fully paid for/reimbursed
87	6%	b. Partially paid for/reimbursed
957	65%	c. No financial assistance from employer
347	24%	d. Not applicable/not employed
26	2%	No Response

10. Please indicate the approximate total annual income of your household:

50	3%	a. $ 4,999 or less	137	9%	f. $25-$29,999
76	5%	b. $ 5,000-$ 9,999	128	9%	g. $30-$34,999
109	7%	c. $10,000-$14,999	113	8%	h. $35-$39,999
112	8%	d. $15,000-$19,999	524	36%	i. $40,000+
142	10%	e. $20,000-$24,999	84	5%	No Response

11. Students who may be exempt from the new $40 differential fee are described on the enclosed sheet. PLEASE READ THESE DESCRIPTIONS CAREFULLY and indicate if you think you qualify for and plan to apply for one of the exemptions:

82	6%	a. Dislocated worker
31	2%	b. Displaced homemaker
45	3%	c. Student on public assistance (AFDC, SSI, etc.)
16	1%	d. Student paying nonresident tuition
1301	88%	No Response

12. Do you plan to reenroll at one of our colleges next semester (Spring 1993)? (42 3% No Response)

718 49% Yes If Yes, for how many units? Avg. = 5

715 48% No If No, please indicate why: (% based on 715)

54	8%	a. My educational objective will be completed.
463	65%	b. New fees will make college too expensive.
44	6%	c. Plan to "stop out" and reenroll at a later time.
53	7%	d. Will enroll at another school: (% based on 53)

7 (13%) University of California campus
37 (70%) California State University campus
1 (2%) California Independent University
2 (4%) Public out-of-state university
0 (0%) Private out-of-state university
0 (0%) Another California community college
6 (11%) Other (please specify) (Various)

90 13% e. Other reasons: (Various)
11 2% Answered No, but gave no reason

COMMENTS: [If you have any additional comments, add them here.]

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS SURVEY!

[Please return this form in the postage-paid envelope as soon as possible.]

SACRAMENTO CITY COLLEGE AMERICAN RIVER COLLEGE COSUMNES RIVER COLLEGE

October 12, 1992

Dear Student:

I am writing to all students who are enrolled in our colleges this fall and who have a bachelor's degree. As you may know, the California Legislature recently passed a bill that will increase community college fees this coming Spring 1993 semester.

For students who already hold a bachelor's degree, the fee will be $50 per unit -- $10 for the general enrollment fee plus a $40 differential fee. The legislation also provides for a waiver of the $40 per unit differential fee for students who qualify under one of several categories explained on the enclosed sheet.

Please read the categories carefully as you might qualify for a differential fee waiver. If you have questions, you can check with your college Financial Aid Office.

We are concerned about your educational future and we want to do all we can to help you reach your educational goals. To do that we need your help. Please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it to us in the prepaid postage envelope within ten days.

Your response is appreciated and will do a great deal to help us plan for the coming semester.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Marjorie K. Blaha

Marjorie K. Blaha, Ed.D.
Chancellor

MKB:jh

Enclosure

1919 SPANOS COURT • SACRAMENTO, CA 95825-3981 • 916-568-3021

Exemptions from Payment of Differential Fees

A community college student who holds a baccalaureate degree is exempt from paying the $40 per unit differential fee if he or she qualifies under one of the following categories:

1) **A nonresident student** paying nonresident tuition.

2) **A dislocated worker.** A dislocated worker is one who has been terminated or laid off; or laid off as a result of permanent closure of a plant or other facility; or self-employed (including farmers) but now unemployed because of poor economic conditions in the community or a natural disaster.
Note: Proof of this status requires certification by the Sacramento Employment and Training Agency (SETA).

3) **A recipient of public assistance** such as Aid to Families with Dependent Children, the Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Program, or a general assistance program.

4) **A displaced homemaker.** A displaced homemaker is one who has not worked in the labor force for five years or more but has during those years worked in the home providing unpaid service for family members and has been dependent on public assistance or the income of another family member but is no longer receiving that income.

BA+ STUDENTS SPEAK OUT!

Summary of Comments
Survey of Fall 1992 BA+ Students Attending Los Rios Colleges

Analysis
by
Verna M. Puglisi
Office of Planning & Research

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BA+ DEGREE STUDENTS SPEAK OUT!

As part of our student survey, we provided space where students could write comments. Many took advantage of the opportunity and some wrote in considerable detail about their specific situations, the reasons they were seeking additional education at the community college, and especially what they felt about the fees. Not surprisingly, since 60% of these students were attending for job-related reasons, many of the comments concerned the fact that these students needed to take additional courses to make themselves employable in today's job market. As our survey results also showed, the assumption that students with BA or higher degrees were working and relatively affluent proved untrue for many of these students, and their comments often reflected their difficult economic circumstances. The analysis which follows is based upon reading over 600 comments from these students and, while somewhat subjective, is intended to provide some of the ideas and concerns expressed by the students. These comments varied tremendously—usually against the imposition of a differential fee (although a few did favor it).

The following is a sample of these students' feelings:

- *I'm being discriminated against...are you sure this is legal?*
- *Why am I being penalized for having an education?*
- *Now my BA is working against me!*
- *Having a BA degree doesn't necessarily mean high $$s!*
- *I'm resentful of minorities!*
- *Has education become a luxury?*
- *I feel that my "continuing education" is ending.*
- *Thanks for nothing! By the way, what does the differential fee pay for?*
- *Middle class pays for all!*
- *$6 per unit is too little, but $50 per unit is too much!*
- *Comes down to relative value—waiting in lines, crowded classrooms, etc.; now I'll go elsewhere!*
- *Will BA students wear yellow stars, receive more services, etc. for their extra $40?*
- *Thank goodness my husband, who is only a high school grad, makes twice as much as I do.*

- *I'm moving to Idaho—good luck in salvaging the community college system; you'll need it!*
- *I'm disappointed that these opportunities (community college system) are now out of my reach.*
- *Why not let us enroll after the second week in empty seats.*
- *Charging $50/unit goes against what the CC was started for...thanks for abandoning me!*
- *I know other students who are going to lie next semester—How can you tell if we have a BA?*

There were noticeable overlaps in the various fields checked; students sometimes checked several categories even though the questionnaire asked for the MOST IMPORTANT (upon reading their comments, they could reasonably have fallen into more than one). Sometimes interpretation varied from one student to another. Circumstances might be the same but the reason checked would be entirely different, i.e., Spanish being taken for use on the job could be checked as upgrading job skills by one student, while another would consider it to be personal interest/ educational development. Also, whether the student planned to return the following semester did not depend on how well they could afford it. Senior citizens with lower incomes taking swimming for health or a humanities class for enrichment often planned to return, whereas someone with $40K> might just as easily go elsewhere to "get their money's worth." Besides money's worth, there is also "unit's" worth—as one student stated, he would rather pay $150 for a class where the units are guaranteed to be transferable (National University).

Not all comments were negative—there were some students who thought the fee increase was a good idea and only fair that they should pay; these students usually were in the upper income brackets. Some students, while not really disagreeing with the fee increase, cited the method/timeliness of the administration's action. A common complaint which crossed over educational need or income, whether they agreed with the fee increase or not, was why the Legislature didn't gradually build up to the increase over a period of time, rather than suddenly in one semester.

It is interesting to note that whether students would return did not depend so much on their ability to "afford" the fee increase or even their MOST IMPORTANT reason for attending—be it to acquire new skills for a career change, upgrade present job skills or even for personal interest. Rather, it seemed from their comments, the single determining factor for persistence was simply how much they value education.

The following comments are organized according to the main reason the student gave for attending one of the Los Rios colleges.

Acquire skills for new job/career

- *My degree is 20 years old!*
- *The system is designed to perpetuate hopelessness.*
- *I should have stayed unemployed & gone on welfare—then I could afford school!*
- *System is designed to trap people into professions in an ever-changing job market!*
- *Employment conditions change!*
- *My BA was sort of a hobby (Anthropology); now I've decided I want to be a nurse.*
- *The education I'm receiving is just as crucial to my career needs and personal growth as it is to individuals without a degree!*

A typical reason for acquiring skills for a second career was that the BA degree was worthless in the **job market**. An Art major working towards a welding certificate wasn't sure if he could afford to continue. Another student kept trying different occupations to obtain full-time employment (her last job was as a teacher earning $350 per month). Another student fearing being laid off, retraining for another career also said she had a Masters degree, but earned less than $25,000 annually. Still another student pointed this out quite well when she asked, "Did anyone stop to think why they (BA students) were back in school in the first place—to get a job to support themselves, because they didn't have a job or couldn't find a job in their field of study!" Added another student, "I feel that there are very few people who are working in the same field in which they got their degree. Most of us have to go back to college for retraining or because of career changes. A community college is really the only feasible way to go if you are on a tight budget."

Many of these students are now being forced to get their education **elsewhere**. One student (income less than $20,000) attempting to complete the legal assisting program, would be forced to switch to a private "business college at an accelerated pace for comparable fees". As would the mother of young children who had stayed out of the work force for a few years until her children were all of school age and who now needs to take refresher classes to re-enter.

Some degrees do not provide all the training to enter the job market; a UC graduate complained that the Interpreter Training Program is not available through UC system, or she would have completed it while getting her degree.

A student who completed his training for a new career was grateful to CC for the opportunity, but at the same time felt sorry for other BA students who hadn't finished their **re-training** before the fee increase. Students, for instance, like the woman who had worked to support herself since she was 16 years old; earned a degree in Social Science; but, unable to get work in that field went to work for a hotel; was laid off recently; now still unemployed and running out of money, she desperately asks, "I want to go back to school for a chance at a better career. Please give me that chance."

Throughout the survey, **retired** students and/or **senior citizens** kept popping up in every way possible; many were actively retraining for second careers. One retired state worker taking writing courses for a second career now cannot afford to continue. Another retired student developing new skills for another career commented that while she realized the colleges were probably trying to "weed out" people like herself, she also noticed that in her evening classes these same "people" were much more diligent and eager to learn than younger students. Said another, "this fee has effectively kicked out all us 'old ladies' who want to learn—who study, who get good grades, who attend evening class."

Nursing seemed to be the most popular new job/career choice identified (often the student failed to check "Nursing" under the occupational major category, probably because they weren't actually enrolled in the program yet). One student pointed out that the nursing program is a two year commitment; at the beginning or her program, she hadn't prepared to pay the higher fee.

Often students began a second career because of **health** reasons. An ex-Vietnam helicopter pilot was forced into early retirement from his firefighter career after brain surgery (he received very low $ because it was non-industrial related). He started over again at age 47, but now cannot afford the fee (<$14K annual income).

Upgrade skills for present career field

♦ *Education needs & skills do not remain the same over a long period of time.*

♦ *This is a Catch 22. Without my coursework, I can't get a job—I feel as though I'm being held hostage!*

Regardless of income or career choice, many needed to upgrade job skills and quite often these students couldn't understand the fee increase. "I thought community colleges were for all members of the community to enrich their lives and continue learning—not just the young," complained a computer science student whose income exceeded $40,000. Another "older" student with a very different point of view for upgrading job skills said, "at my age, I don't think the additional courses will benefit me that much in my career...the time has come to seek other alternatives that will provide a better cost to units earned ratio." A third felt that as her age increases, she has to worry more about keeping up in skills with younger people. This is just another way to keep the "status quo—once you're in a field, you're stuck." Another older

student who understands the need to help people who have not completed a degree also asks why are people like herself who return to school in mid-life being discriminated against just "because many got **useless liberal arts degrees earlier in their lives".**

Many **self-employed** students found it necessary to take accounting or learn word processing and computer skills, especially if they had a small business.

"Because of changing atmosphere and types of jobs available in the workforce and because of the changing makeup of the workforce, I have to attend college to keep up with all the changes. It's an ignorant government that doesn't understand the importance of continuing education. I make a good salary now, but without continuing education this could change." Still agreeing, another student felt caught between wanting to improve job performance and the financial investment.

Foreign language was often indicated as type of course taken to upgrade job skills (in a wide variety of professions, but especially among school teachers). One **high school teacher** complained she would not be able to update her teaching skills which are important to both herself and her students. Another student said, "more and more of our workforce is hispanic." This same student also takes **computer** classes because his work place is very rapidly becoming fully automated.

Many students who indicated they were upgrading present job skills also felt it was an option they could no longer afford. One student feels the state is going to become a haven for minimum wage earners with no additional skills. "**Even people with BA/BS degrees will stagnate and use outdated skills**."

Maintain certificate or license

- *Are there any exceptions regarding the $50 if you're enrolled in a very expensive school program (dental hygiene)*

- *I know many RN students with BA degrees who may be forced to drop out*

A variety of careers requiring certificates were mentioned. **Teaching** often stood out as a profession which provided more than monetary rewards. One teacher stated she purchased classroom materials for her students out of her own pocket and was in the process of taking an ECE class to fulfill supervisory units; another was taking Spanish to better communicate with her Hispanic students; yet another gave up a well-paying job to make a difference in the lives of young people, and as a teacher she now needs to complete 150 hours of coursework to renew credential points. A Catholic sister from the Philippines supported by donations is taking ECE classes to qualify to teach elementary school and hopes to be exempt from differential fee.

One student predicts that **real estate** licensing and ongoing certification courses will lose all their current degree students and the colleges should expect a major drop in enrollment.

Another student pointed out, "...even with a BA/BS, some employers require specific certification, (i.e., **library technology**); the fee is almost like a penalty to those of us who need to add to or enhance our BA to make us look more attractive to potential employers."

Earn transferable units toward another degree

♦ *I'm still paying off the loan for my first degree!*

Often the **foreign** student whose degree doesn't count in this country is forced to start over again. One student from the Philippines said he didn't get enough knowledge from his BS—there is a big difference between our education and that of the Philippines, especially in technical classes. Even when the student feels he is qualified professionally (as did one student from India), he questions the fairness of being charged the differential fee for possessing an "**unacknowledged** degree". Another student (from England) planning to take 16 units next semester working towards MA in History and teaching at a community college will have to wait until he has saved the $800.

In addition to foreign students being required to earn a second degree, many native U.S. students **needed** a second degree. Quite often these students were taking undergraduate classes for a Master's Degree in a different field or because a particular Bachelor's degree does not automatically mean the student is able to work in that field. As one student stated, her BS in "Pre-Physical Therapy" doesn't even allow her to get a job as a physical therapist—she needs to have a Master's or a BS in Physical Therapy. Another student with a 20-year-old degree thought that at the time she earned her BA, it wasn't important in what—just that she had a BA. Now, however, she feels she was wrong and is having to start over again and "on top of that, is being asked to pay more than first time students. When we all graduate, though, we will all be competing for the same jobs!" Another student, away from school since 1970, is uncertain about his job in today's economic conditions, chose to take prerequisite classes to qualify for his master's program now asks why other students who do not complete classes they sign up for are not penalized in the least, while he completes each class—he has **the purpose and desire to continue**.

Again, **nursing** was often named—this time as the **major** for a second degree (previously, cited as a second career). It seems like a popular choice for many students starting over again (more steady job market?).

An engineering student feels his hopes of a second degree "are now shattered" and he also claims that it is not his responsibility "to finance the education of those students without bachelor's degrees." He closes his comments by thanking the "Golden State."

Another student embittered at the government for increasing the fees just because he was awarded a degree complains, "My degree does absolutely nothing for me. It doesn't qualify me for a single job. I must go on to graduate or to a professional school in order to make my education worth anything."

Personal interest/educational development

- *Education should be valued for its own sake, not just in terms of job training!*
- *This is really sad.*
- *A bachelor's program is specific, now I feel a need to take classes I was unable to take then.*
- *No problem regarding the increased fees and will gladly pay them—still a bargain!*
- *I can afford to pay, but don't care to as the fees are outrageous in principle!*
- *Personal interest—that's what libraries and book stores are for!*

Many (especially seniors) view attendance at a community college as a source of lifelong continuing educational enrichment, social activity, and even health maintenance. They may or may not be able to afford the fee increase, many probably will not continue taking what they considered an "extra." Many seniors said they were "sad" that they could not continue in what had been a source of joy; their classes helped them from becoming depressed.

It seemed that there was a larger proportion of upper income students in this group (>$40K) which might also account for the greater number of favorable responses to the fee. Many of these students felt they could afford the increase and even agreed that it was fair they should now help pay for other students' education. But some expressed concern for other BA+ students who might not be as able to afford the fee. Surprisingly, these other BA+ students often agreed with the increase even when they didn't make as much money.

One student even went so far as to suggest that classes taken for "personal interest" (including his own business/computer science/management class) should not be subsidized at all since they benefit a very small portion of the population at the expense of all taxpayers.

These students took a wide variety of classes (everything from business or social science to art and music). A **foreign language** was often cited as the personal interest class taken, but might be discontinued even when the student's income exceeded $40,000 annually. Interestingly, just as often, it didn't discourage the student from continuing. One student was even willing to travel out of town and pay more in order to attend a conversational French class at SCC's Davis Center. Another husband and wife (also earning >$40K) who were also both taking the same French class will not continue next semester (4 units @ $50 for two people = $400).

Improve basic skills in English/reading/math

- *Selected programs should be exempt from increased fees!*

A blind student from Bolivia working towards a second degree in counseling needs to complete English classes before he can begin taking psychology classes (income less than $5,000 he had his wife fill out the questionnaire).

Other reasons

- *The reason my income is high is that I live with my parents (pursuing Master's prerequisites).*

- *Educators should be exempt—either we are in the wrong business or crazy!*

There were some very interesting and unusual responses listed under this category—the student pursuing skills for volunteer activities as a Master Gardener (who would drop classes because the fees were more than she could afford to "enhance" a volunteer activity); an unemployed student (whose husband is also out of work) taking a "refresher" Spanish class to help acquire a job; several other students who already work part time as "contract students" had to maintain at least six units just to keep their jobs (CSUS Hornet Foundation).

This category was often cited for **health** reasons, (though more urgent than the PE class to "keep fit" in the personal interest category) many seniors "needed" to take swimming classes to relieve the pain and stiffness of arthritis. There was even a firefighter who took physical fitness as a job requirement.

A Los Rios District math instructor checked this category because she takes a sign language class to communicate directly with her nonhearing students. She hopes that the district will consider reimbursing her. A kindergarten teacher with eight non-English speaking children in her class is taking Spanish to keep her district within state "compliance" (she also hopes her district will reimburse her).

A nurse hoping to go through a **nurse practitioner program** needing to "update her knowledge" is repeating anatomy and physiology classes.

SACRAMENTO CITY COLLEGE AMERICAN RIVER COLLEGE COSUMNES RIVER COLLEGE

Los Rios Community College District
Baccalaureate Student Survey Highlights

The district has just completed a special survey of the 4,009 baccalaureate degree students enrolled in Fall 1992 (about 8% of our student population). The overall response rate was 37%, and the respondent population did vary from the survey population with somewhat more women, older and white students among the respondents. In terms of demographics, 76% of respondents were over 30 years old, 65% were women, and 23% were ethnic minorities.

This survey addressed the baccalaureate students' goals and background, and the potential effect of the new $40-per-unit differential fee on their educational plans. Initial findings of the survey include the following:

- Almost 60% of the baccalaureate students are attending for job-related reasons; 9% are earning transfer units toward a different degree; and 26% are enrolled for personal development.
- More than half (55%) are employed full-time and 19% part-time.
- Surprisingly, 11% are unemployed and seeking work, higher than the unemployment percentage statewide or in the Sacramento region.
- Almost 72% are taking fewer than 6 units, and 63% are attending only during the evenings.
- Almost half (47%) of these students received their baccalaureate degrees from the CSU system and 17% from the UC system. Fully a third (34%) received their degrees from either independent (private) or out-of-state institutions.
- Two out of three (65%) said their employer provided no financial assistance toward their educational expenses, and only 10% were partially or fully reimbursed.

1919 SPANOS COURT • SACRAMENTO, CA 95825-3981 • 916-568-3021

- In terms of annual household income, 23% of the baccalaureate students reported less than $20,000; in fact, 8% had an annual income of under $10,000. Over 35% reported between $20,000 and $40,000, and 36% $40,000 or more.

- Relatively few (12%) of the students believed they might be eligible for one of the fee exemption categories (6% as dislocated workers, 3% on public assistance, 2% as displaced homemakers, and 1% already paying nonresident tuition).

- Almost half of the students (48%) stated they would not return to one of the Los Rios colleges next semester, the great majority (65%) because they felt the new fees would make college too expensive.

Additional analyses of the survey information have been completed, and results by college are available upon request. A previous analysis of the baccalaureate students' course-taking patterns and demographics was produced by the district's Office of Planning and Research and is available both by district and by college.

Los Rios Community College District
Office of Planning and Research
November 16, 1992

SACRAMENTO CITY COLLEGE AMERICAN RIVER COLLEGE COSUMNES RIVER COLLEGE

Los Rios Community College District
Baccalaureate Students' Course Taking Patterns and Demographics

Given the new state legislation for community colleges, the Los Rios district wanted to know the answers to two key questions about its baccalaureate students:

1. What courses are these students enrolled in?

2. What do we know about them demographically and in terms of their reasons for enrolling?

To answer these questions, the Los Rios District Office of Planning and Research analyzed the entire Fall 1992 student file and the highlights below are for the 4,009 students districtwide who indicated on their application that they held a baccalaureate or higher degree. These students represent 8.3% of the 48,199 students districtwide counted for 4th Week Census. (Separate analyses were done for each of the colleges, since each college has a somewhat different curriculum and different student population.)

The 4,009 baccalaureate students districtwide enrolled in 6,557 courses (one student can enroll in more than one course, and at more than one college). Looking at the frequency of course enrollments by department, the following are the "top ten" areas for baccalaureate student enrollment:

- PE/Rec (477, 7.3% of the total)
- Computer Information Science (466, 7.1%)
- Biology (404, 6.2%)
- Art (357, 5.4%)
- Accounting (272, 4.1%)
- Spanish (269, 4.1%)
- Chemistry (250, 3.8%)
- Math (230, 3.5%)
- Real Estate (213, 3.2%)
- English (182, 2.8%)

While these are the "top ten" areas, our analysis has shown that our baccalaureate students take courses across virtually all areas of the curriculum, with no one area accounting for more than 8% of the total.

1919 SPANOS COURT • SACRAMENTO, CA 95825-3981 • 916-568-3021

Moving to our demographic and application information analysis, here are the highlights about our 4,009 baccalaureate students:

- 42% of these students are at ARC; 36% at SCC; 18% at CRC; and 4% at Placerville.
- 60% are women; 71% are 30 years of age or older.
- 29% are ethnic minorities: 10% Asian, 6% Hispanic, 5% African-American, 3% Filipino, 1% American Indian, 4% other; and 71% white.
- 63% are enrolled in evening courses, 28% in day courses, and 9% enrolled in both day and evening courses.
- 77% are enrolled for the lightest unit load (.5 to 5.5 units); 19% are mid-load students (6-11.5 units); and 4% are enrolled full-time (12 or more units).
- 46% of the baccalaureate students enrolled for occupational reasons:
    - 25% enrolled to upgrade job skills.
    - 10% to acquire new job skills.
    - 7% to obtain a vocational certificate.
    - 4% to get a vocational AA degree.
- 13% said they planned to transfer (8% without an AA; 5% with an AA), and 40% stated they had enrolled with no specific AA/certificate objective.
- 98% of these students are in good standing academically.
- 94% are U.S. citizens, while 4% are on permanent student visas. (Fewer than 1% are in each of the other three citizenship categories.)

The District is also sending a survey to these students to collect additional information about their plans for the Spring 1993 semester and their reactions to the new baccalaureate fee. This information should be available by November.

Los Rios Community College District
Office of Planning and Research
September 1992

(WP5\TEXT\MEMO\BA)

SACRAMENTO CITY COLLEGE AMERICAN RIVER COLLEGE COSUMNES RIVER COLLEGE

Los Rios Community College District
Baccalaureate Students' Course-Taking Patterns and Demographics

Spring 1993

The Los Rios District Office of Planning and Research analyzed the entire Spring 1993 student file and the highlights below are for the 2,427 students districtwide who indicated on their application that they held a baccalaureate or higher degree. These students represent 5.3 % of the 45,391 students districtwide counted for 4th Week Census. (Separate analyses were done for each of the colleges, since each college has a somewhat different curriculum and different student population.)

The 2,427 baccalaureate students districtwide enrolled in 4,011 courses (one student can enroll in more than one course, and at more than one college). Looking at the frequency of course enrollments by department, the following are the "top ten" areas for baccalaureate student enrollment:

- Biology (366, 9.1% of the total)
- Computer Information Science (247, 6.2%)
- PE/Rec (231, 5.8%)
- Chemistry (228, 5.7%)
- Art (203, 5.1%)
- Accounting (152, 3.8%)
- Spanish (135, 3.4%)
- Math (123, 3.1%)
- Physics (104, 2.6%)
- English (99, 2.5%)

While these are the "top ten" areas, our analysis has shown that our baccalaureate students take courses across virtually all areas of the curriculum, with no one area accounting for more than 10% of the total.

1919 SPANOS COURT • SACRAMENTO, CA 95825-3981 • 916-568-3021

Moving to our demographic and application information analysis, here are the highlights about our 2,427 baccalaureate students:

- 40% of these students are at ARC; 37% at SCC; 19% at CRC; and 4% at Placerville.
- 62% are women; 72% are 30 years of age or older.
- 29% are ethnic minorities: 10% Asian, 5% Hispanic, 5% African-American, 3% Filipino, 1% American Indian, 5% other; and 71% white.
- 58% are enrolled in evening courses, 33% in day courses, and 9% enrolled in both day and evening courses.
- 77% are enrolled for the lightest unit load (.5 to 5.5 units); 19% are mid-load students (6-11.5 units); and 4% are enrolled full-time (12 or more units).
- 43% of the baccalaureate students enrolled for occupational reasons:
  - 21% enrolled to upgrade job skills.
  - 9% to acquire new job skills.
  - 8% to obtain a vocational certificate.
  - 5% to get a vocational AA degree.
- 13% said they planned to transfer (9% without an AA; 4% with an AA), and 43% stated they had enrolled with no specific AA/certificate objective.
- 98% of these students are in good standing academically.
- 94% are U.S. citizens, while 4% are on permanent student visas.

Los Rios Community College District
Office of Planning and Research
February 1993

(WP5\TEXT\MEMO\BA.S93)

COMPARISON OF BA+ STUDENTS' COURSE-TAKING PATTERNS
Fall 1992-Spring 1993

LOS RIOS DISTRICT

The following summary shows the "top ten/eleven" departments in terms of BA+ student enrollments in Fall 1992 and Spring 1993 (percentages are of all BA+ course enrollments). The last two columns show the net "loss" in individual enrollments, followed by the percentage loss compared to the previous semester. Departments are listed in order of percentage loss in enrollments in Spring 1993 compared to Fall 1992.

	Fall 1992		Spring 1993		Loss in Enrollments	% Loss From Fall 1992
TOTALS (all BA+ courses)	**6,557**	**100%**	**4,011**	**100%**	**-2546**	**-38.8%**
▸ Real Estate**	213	3.2%	97	2.4%	-116	-54.5%
▸ PE/Recreation	477	7.3%	231	5.8%	- 246	-51.6%
▸ Spanish	269	4.1%	135	3.4%	- 134	-49.8%
▸ Computer Info Science	466	7.1%	247	6.2%	- 219	-47.0%
▸ Mathematics	230	3.5%	123	3.1%	- 107	-46.5%
▸ English	182	2.8%	99	2.5%	- 83	-45.6%
▸ Accounting	272	4.1%	152	3.8%	- 120	-44.1%
▸ Art	357	5.4%	203	5.1%	- 154	-43.1%
▸ Physics*	157	2.4%	104	2.6%	- 53	- 33.8%
▸ Biology	404	6.2%	366	9.1%	- 38	- 9.4%
▸ Chemistry	250	3.8%	228	5.7%	- 22	- 8.8%

*Not in Fall '92 Top 10
**Not in Spring '93 Top 10

LOS RIOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
ALL STUDENTS—SPRING 92 AND SPRING 93

Demographics & Other Characteristics		%		Number		Net Change		
		Spring 92	Spring 93	Spring 92	Spring 93	% Pts	Number	% Chg
TOTAL STUDENTS		100.0	100.0	49,267	45,391	0.0	-3,876	-7.9
GENDER	Women	56.3	56.3	27,721	25,508	0.0	-2,213	-8.0
	Men	43.7	43.7	21,526	19,832	0.0	-1,694	-7.9
	Unknown			20	51		31	
ETHNICITY	African American	9.4	9.3	4,650	4,200	-0.1	-450	-9.7
	American Indian	2.2	2.2	1,086	996	0.0	-90	-8.3
	Asian	10.6	11.5	5,243	5,239	0.9	-4	-0.1
	Caucasian	61.5	58.9	30,287	26,738	-2.6	-3,549	-11.7
	Filipino	2.2	2.5	1,085	1,112	0.3	27	2.5
	Latino	9.9	10.4	4,860	4,727	0.5	-133	-2.7
	Other	3.4	4.5	1,682	2,019	1.1	337	20.0
	Unknown (No Code)	0.8	0.8	374	360	0.0	-14	-3.7
AGE GROUP	Under 18	1.5	1.6	715	730	0.1	15	2.1
	18 to 20	22.8	23.9	11,252	10,825	1.1	-427	-3.8
	21 to 24	22.6	23.4	11,140	10,600	0.8	-540	-4.9
	25 to 29	16.3	16.3	8,050	7,383	0.0	-667	-8.3
	30 to 39	21.6	20.6	10,624	9,333	-1.0	-1,291	-12.2
	40 or older	15.2	14.4	7,486	6,520	-0.8	-966	-12.9
	30 or older	36.8	35.0	18,110	15,853	-1.8	-2,257	-12.5
DAY EVENING	Both Day/Evening	17.1	18.1	8,399	8,212	1.0	-187	-2.2
	Day only	45.5	47.2	22,420	21,407	1.7	-1,013	-4.5
	Evening only	37.4	34.8	18,448	15,772	-2.6	-2,676	-14.5
UNIT LOAD	Full time (12+)	22.3	23.6	10,968	10,689	1.3	-279	-2.5
	Mid (6-11.5)	32.6	33.2	16,062	15,080	0.6	-982	-6.1
	Light (.5-5.5)	45.1	43.2	22,211	19,594	-1.9	-2,617	-11.8
	Average number/units			7.02	7.25		+.23	
EDUCATIONAL GOAL	Transfer/no AA	19.9	18.4	9,630	8,239	-1.5	-1,391	-14.4
	Transfer/with AA	40.5	38.9	19,581	17,419	-1.6	-2,162	-11.0
	Vocational AA	6.3	6.1	3,056	2,731	-0.2	-325	-10.6
	General Education AA	3.7	2.7	1,796	1,220	-1.0	-576	-32.1
	Vocational Certificate	5.3	4.5	2,536	2,015	-0.8	-521	-20.5
	Acquire Job Skill	4.4	3.0	2,114	1,321	-1.4	-793	-37.5
	Upgrade Job Skill	7.7	5.1	3,737	2,286	-2.6	-1,451	-38.8
	No AA/certificate goal	12.1	21.4	5,862	9,566	9.3	3,704	63.2
ENROLLMENT STATUS	New, never attended	8.5	9.9	4,191	4,479	1.4	288	6.9
	New, attended 2 yr	6.8	7.0	3,339	3,194	0.2	-145	-4.3
	New, attended 4 yr	5.6	4.0	2,777	1,806	-1.6	-971	-35.0
	Returning (prev. LR)	12.4	9.0	6,111	4,103	-3.4	-2,008	-32.9
	Returning (@ 2 yr)	2.7	2.3	1,334	1,025	-0.4	-309	-23.2
	Returning (@ 4 yr)	3.1	1.9	1,510	850	-1.2	-660	-43.7
	High School Student	0.7	0.7	348	336	0.0	-12	-3.5
	Continuing	60.2	65.2	29,654	29,583	5.0	-71	-0.2

TABLEVALLSS.DIS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LOS RIOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
BA+ STUDENTS—SPRING 92 AND SPRING 93

Demographics & Other Characteristics		%		Number		Net Change		
		Spring 92	Spring 93	Spring 92	Spring 93	% Pts	Number	% Chg
TOTAL STUDENTS		100.0	100.0	4,577	2,413	0.0	-2,164	-47.3
GENDER	Women	57.9	61.7	2,649	1,488	3.8	-1,161	-43.8
	Men	42.1	38.3	1,928	924	-3.8	-1,004	-52.1
	Unknown			0	1		1	
ETHNICITY	African American	5.7	4.5	260	108	-1.2	-152	-58.5
	American Indian	1.5	1.4	70	33	-0.1	-37	-52.9
	Asian	9.2	9.8	421	237	0.6	-184	-43.7
	Caucasian	71.9	71.7	3,290	1,729	-0.2	-1,561	-47.5
	Filipino	1.9	2.6	87	62	0.7	-25	-28.7
	Latino	5.6	4.6	256	110	-1.0	-146	-57.0
	Other	3.7	4.5	170	109	0.8	-61	-35.9
	Unknown (No Code)	0.5	1.0	23	25	0.5	2	8.7
AGE GROUP	Under 18	0.0	0.0	2	0	0.0	-2	-100.0
	18 to 20	0.2	0.0	9	1	-0.2	-8	-88.9
	21 to 24	11.1	7.5	506	180	-3.6	-326	-64.4
	25 to 29	19.6	20.8	898	501	1.2	-397	-44.2
	30 to 39	33.1	32.3	1,516	779	-0.8	-737	-48.6
	40 or older	36.0	39.5	1,646	952	3.5	-694	-42.2
	30 or older	69.1	71.8	3,162	1,731	2.7	-1,431	-45.3
DAY EVENING	Both Day/Evening	8.7	9.3	397	224	0.6	-173	-43.6
	Day only	26.3	32.9	1,203	793	6.6	-410	-34.1
	Evening only	65.0	57.9	2,977	1,396	-7.1	-1,581	-53.1
UNIT LOAD	Full time (12+)	2.8	3.5	129	84	0.7	-45	-34.9
	Mid (6-11.5)	18.1	19.0	830	458	0.9	-372	-44.8
	Light (.5-5.5)	79.0	77.5	3,617	1,871	-1.5	-1,746	-48.3
	Average number/units			3.95	4.16		+.21	
EDUCATIONAL GOAL	Transfer/no AA	7.9	9.0	355	213	1.1	-142	-40.0
	Transfer/with AA	5.3	4.1	236	97	-1.2	-139	-58.9
	Vocational AA	3.4	4.9	151	117	1.5	-34	-22.5
	General Education AA	1.1	1.0	47	23	-0.1	-24	-51.1
	Vocational Certificate	6.5	7.6	291	181	1.1	-110	-37.8
	Acquire Job Skill	10.8	8.7	485	207	-2.1	-278	-57.3
	Upgrade Job Skill	30.6	21.0	1,375	500	-9.6	-875	-63.6
	No AA/certificate goal	34.6	43.8	1,554	1,041	9.2	-513	-33.0
ENROLLMENT STATUS	New, never attended	0.3	2.2	13	52	1.9	39	300.0
	New, attended 2 yr	0.0	2.0	2	48	2.0	46	2,300.0
	New, attended 4 yr	30.7	21.8	1,404	525	-8.9	-879	-62.6
	Returning (prev. LR)	13.0	6.8	596	165	-6.2	-431	-72.3
	Returning (@ 2 yr)	0.0	1.2	1	28	1.2	27	2,700.0
	Returning (@ 4 yr)	14.1	11.3	646	273	-2.8	-373	-57.7
	High School Student	0.0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0	
	Continuing	41.8	54.8	1,914	1,322	13.0	-592	-30.9

TABLE\BASS.DIS

Students Who Stayed (Spring 1992/Spring 1993)

LOS RIOS DISTRICT

		Stayed in S'92		Stayed in S'93		
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	% Change
	Total Students	49,267	100.0	45,391	100.0	-7.9%
	Fall Spring Stay %	28,261	57.4%	27,442	60.5%	-2.9%
Gender	Women	16,135	57.1	15,488	56.4	-4.0%
	Men	12,126	42.9	11,952	43.6	-1.4%
	Uncoded	0	*****	2	*****	*****
Ethnicity	Afro-American	2,441	8.6	2,387	8.7	-2.2%
	American Indian	582	2.1	588	2.1	1.0%
	Asian	3,403	12.0	3,546	12.9	4.2%
	Caucasian	17,303	61.2	16,097	58.7	-7.0%
	Filipino	669	2.4	692	2.5	3.4%
	Latino	2,747	9.7	2,917	10.6	6.2%
	Other	907	3.2	1,044	3.8	15.1%
	Unknown (Not Coded)	209	0.7	171	0.6	-18.2%
Age Group	17 and Under	215	0.8	227	0.8	5.6%
	18 to 20	7,950	28.1	7,626	27.8	-4.1%
	21 to 24	6,601	23.4	6,598	24.0	0.0%
	25 to 29	4,241	15.0	4,260	15.5	0.4%
	30 to 39	5,526	19.6	5,283	19.3	-4.4%
	40 and over	3,728	13.2	3,448	12.6	-7.5%
Schedule	Day Only	14,441	51.1	14,185	51.7	-1.8%
	Evening Only	7,836	27.7	7,357	26.8	-6.1%
	Both Day/Evening	5,984	21.2	5,900	21.5	-1.4%
Unit Load	0.1 to 5.9	9,012	31.9	8,704	31.7	-3.4%
	6.0 to 11.9	10,291	36.4	9,916	36.1	-3.6%
	12.0 and up	8,951	31.7	8,815	32.1	-1.5%
College Units Comp.	None	765	2.7	774	2.8	1.2%
	0.5 to 15.5	9,997	35.4	9,306	33.9	-6.9%
	16.0 to 29.5	4,439	15.7	4,477	16.3	0.9%
	30.0 to 45.5	3,999	14.2	4,197	15.3	5.0%
	46.0 to 59.5	2,562	9.1	2,651	9.7	3.5%
	60+ -w- no AA	2,911	10.3	3,113	11.3	6.9%
	60+ -w- AA	1,827	6.5	1,728	6.3	-5.4%
	BA or Higher	1,761	6.2	1,196	4.4	-32.1%

***** = Not Included in Computing Percentages

Students Who Stayed (Spring 1992/Spring 1993)

LOS RIOS DISTRICT

		Stayed in S'92		Stayed in S'93		
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	% Change
Educational Goal	Transfer no AA	6,012	21.7	5,509	20.4	-8.4%
	Transfer -w- AA	12,921	46.7	12,537	46.4	-3.0%
	Voc. AA	1,777	6.4	1,853	6.9	4.3%
	GE AA	977	3.5	835	3.1	-14.5%
	Voc Cert	1,392	5.0	1,370	5.1	-1.6%
	Acq. Job Skills	848	3.1	672	2.5	-20.8%
	Upg. Job Skills	1,319	4.8	973	3.6	-26.2%
	No AA/Cert Obj.	2,438	8.8	3,282	12.1	34.6%
Enrollment Status	New, No College	10	0.0	1	0.0	-90.0%
	New, Been at 2 yr	12	0.0			-100.0%
	New, Been at 4 yr	4	0.0	1	0.0	-75.0%
	Returning	290	1.0	14	0.1	-95.2%
	Returning, Been at 2 yr	51	0.2	1	0.0	-98.0%
	Returning, Been at 4 yr	37	0.1	5	0.0	-86.5%
	High School Student	158	0.6	144	0.5	-8.9%
	Continuing	27,698	98.0	27,276	99.4	-1.5%

***** = Not Included in Computing Percentages

Students Who Left (Spring 1992/Spring 1993)

LOS RIOS DISTRICT

		Left in S'92		Left in S'93		
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	% Change
	Total Students	49,267	100.0	45,391	100.0	-7.9%
	Fall/Spring Drop %	20,408	41.4%	20,695	45.6%	1.4%
Gender	Women	12,073	59.2	12,166	58.9	0.8%
	Men	8,326	40.8	8,504	41.1	2.1%
	Uncoded	9	*****	25	*****	*****
Ethnicity	Afro-American	2,018	9.9	2,119	10.2	5.0%
	American Indian	496	2.4	468	2.3	-5.6%
	Asian	1,650	8.1	1,731	8.4	4.9%
	Caucasian	13,079	64.1	12,816	61.9	-2.0%
	Filipino	402	2.0	454	2.2	12.9%
	Latino	1,926	9.4	2,096	10.1	8.8%
	Other	642	3.1	814	3.9	26.8%
	Unknown (Not Coded)	195	1.0	197	1.0	1.0%
Age Group	17 and Under	434	2.1	415	2.0	-4.4%
	18 to 20	3,674	18	3,598	17.4	-2.1%
	21 to 24	4,234	20.7	4,495	21.7	6.2%
	25 to 29	3,634	17.8	3,672	17.7	1.0%
	30 to 39	4,866	23.8	4,738	22.9	-2.6%
	40 and over	3,566	17.5	3,777	18.3	5.9%
Schedule	Day Only	8,066	39.5	8,396	40.6	4.1%
	Evening Only	9,814	48.1	9,764	47.2	-0.5%
	Both Day/Evening	2,528	12.4	2,535	12.2	0.3%
Unit Load	0.1 to 5.9	12,429	60.9	12,722	61.6	2.4%
	6.0 to 11.9	5,650	27.7	5,747	27.9	1.7%
	12.0 and up	2,292	11.2	2,185	10.6	-4.7%
College Units Comp.	None	4,449	21.8	4,122	19.9	-7.3%
	0.5 to 15.5	5,414	26.5	5,540	26.8	2.3%
	16.0 to 29.5	1,997	9.8	2,100	10.1	5.2%
	30.0 to 45.5	1,406	6.9	1,460	7.1	3.8%
	46.0 to 59.5	1,163	5.7	1,121	5.4	-3.6%
	60+ -w- no AA	1,561	7.6	1,717	8.3	10.0%
	60+ -w- AA	1,876	9.2	1,696	8.2	-9.6%
	BA or Higher	2,542	12.5	2,938	14.2	15.6%

***** = Not Included in Computing Percentages

Students Who Left (Spring 1992/Spring 1993)

LOS RIOS DISTRICT

		Left in S'92		Left in S'93		
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	% Change
Educational Goal	Transfer no AA	3,594	18.0	3,441	16.9	-4.3%
	Transfer -w- AA	6,912	34.6	6,655	32.8	-3.7%
	Voc. AA	1,217	6.1	1,174	5.8	-3.5%
	GE AA	788	3.9	608	3.0	-22.8%
	Voc Cert	1,030	5.2	996	4.9	-3.3%
	Acq. Job Skills	1,186	5.9	993	4.9	-16.3%
	Upg. Job Skills	2,314	11.6	1,988	9.8	-14.1%
	No AA/Cert Obj.	2,927	14.7	4,447	21.9	51.9%
Enrollment Status						
	New, No College	3,331	16.3	3,181	15.4	-4.5%
	New, Been at 2 yr	2,185	10.7	1,847	8.9	-15.5%
	New, Been at 4 yr	1,922	9.4	1,692	8.2	-12.0%
	Returning	3,426	16.8	3,889	18.8	13.5%
	Returning, Been at 2 yr	671	3.3	442	2.1	-34.1%
	Returning, Been at 4 yr	1,056	5.2	725	3.5	-31.3%
	High School Student	104	0.5	93	0.4	-10.6%

***** = Not Included in Computing Percentages

New/Returning Students (Spring 1992/Spring 1993)

LOS RIOS DISTRICT		New/Ret. in S'92		New/Ret. in S'93		
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	% Change
	Total Students	49,267	100.0	45,391	100.0	-7.9%
	Total New/Returning	21,006	42.6%	17,949	39.5%	-14.6%
Gender	Women	11,586	55.2	10,020	56.0	-13.5%
	Men	9,400	44.8	7,880	44.0	-16.2%
	Uncoded	20	*****	49	*****	*****
Ethnicity	Afro-American	2,209	10.5	1,813	10.1	-17.9%
	American Indian	504	2.4	408	2.3	-19.0%
	Asian	1,840	8.8	1,693	9.4	-8.0%
	Caucasian	12,984	61.8	10,641	59.3	-18.0%
	Filipino	416	2.0	420	2.3	1.0%
	Latino	2,113	10.1	1,810	10.1	-14.3%
	Other	775	3.7	975	5.4	25.8%
	Unknown (Not Coded)	165	0.8	189	1.1	14.5%
Age Group	17 and Under	500	2.4	503	2.8	0.6%
	18 to 20	3,302	15.7	3,199	17.8	-3.1%
	21 to 24	4,539	21.6	4,002	22.3	-11.8%
	25 to 29	3,809	18.1	3,123	17.4	-18.0%
	30 to 39	5,098	24.3	4,050	22.6	-20.6%
	40 and over	3,758	17.9	3,072	17.1	-18.3%
Schedule	Day Only	7,979	38.0	7,222	40.2	-9.5%
	Evening Only	10,612	50.5	8,415	46.9	-20.7%
	Both Day/Evening	2,415	11.5	2,312	12.9	-4.3%
Unit Load	0.1 to 5.9	13,199	62.8	10,890	60.7	-17.5%
	6.0 to 11.9	5,771	27.5	5,164	28.8	-10.5%
	12.0 and up	2,017	9.6	1,874	10.4	-7.1%
College Units Comp.	None	6,116	29.1	5,584	31.1	-8.7%
	0.5 to 15.5	5,173	24.6	4,676	26.1	-9.6%
	16.0 to 29.5	1,709	8.1	1,673	9.3	-2.1%
	30.0 to 45.5	1,294	6.2	1,253	7.0	-3.2%
	46.0 to 59.5	825	3.9	787	4.4	-4.6%
	60+ -w- no AA	1,297	6.2	1,417	7.9	9.3%
	60+ -w- AA	1,776	8.5	1,342	7.5	-24.4%
	BA or Higher	2,816	13.4	1,217	6.8	-56.8%

***** = Not Included in Computing Percentages

New/Returning Students (Spring 1992/Spring 1993)

LOS RIOS DISTRICT

		New/Ret. in S'92		New/Ret. in S'93		
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent	% Change
Educational Goal	Transfer no AA	3,618	17.5	2,730	15.4	-24.5%
	Transfer -w- AA	6,660	32.3	4,822	27.5	-27.6%
	Voc. AA	1,279	6.2	878	4.9	-31.4%
	GE AA	819	4.0	385	2.2	-53.0%
	Voc Cert	1,144	5.5	645	3.6	-43.6%
	Acq. Job Skills	1,266	6.1	649	3.7	-48.7%
	Upg. Job Skills	2,418	11.7	1,313	7.4	-45.7%
	No AA/Cert Obj.	3,424	16.6	6,284	35.4	83.5%
Enrollment Status	New, No College	4,181	19.9	4,478	25.0	7.1%
	New, Been at 2 yr	3,327	15.8	3,194	17.8	-4.0%
	New, Been at 4 yr	2,773	13.2	1,805	10.1	-34.9%
	Returning	5,821	27.7	4,089	22.8	-29.8%
	Returning, Been at 2 yr	1,283	6.1	1,024	5.7	-20.2%
	Returning, Been at 4 yr	1,473	7.0	845	4.7	-42.6%
	High School Student	190	0.9	192	1.1	1.1%
	Continuing	1,956	9.3	2,307	12.9	17.9%

***** = Not Included in Computing Percentages

APPENDIX

American River College

Questionnaire and Responses to BA+ Student Survey—Fall 1992

Highlights of BA+ Student Survey (Fall 1992)

Comparison of College BA+ Students' Course-Taking Patterns (Fall 1992-Spring 1993)

Chart of All Student Characteristics—Spring 1992 & Spring 1993

Chart of BA+ Student Characteristics—Spring 1992 & Spring 1993

LOS RIOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

SURVEY OF BACCALAUREATE DEGREE STUDENTS

AMERICAN RIVER COLLEGE FIGURES (N = 663)

AMERICAN RIVER COLLEGE

COSUMNES RIVER COLLEGE
CRC/PLACERVILLE CENTER

SACRAMENTO CITY COLLEGE

DEAR STUDENT: Your answers to the following questions will help us to schedule courses to meet your needs. (Unless otherwise noted, please check only one response for each item.)

1. What is your MOST IMPORTANT reason for attending our college? (Check only one.)

276	42%	a. To acquire skills for new job/career
131	20%	b. To upgrade skills for present career field
20	3%	c. To maintain certificate or license
2	.3%	d. To improve basic skills in English/reading/math
60	9%	e. To earn transferable units for another degree
142	21%	f. For personal interest/educational development
25	4%	g. Other (please describe) (Various)
7	1%	No Response

2. Are you enrolled in an occupational major program?

Yes 238 36% No 415 63% NR 10 2%

If Yes, which program? (Check only one.)
(% based on 238 who answered Yes)

36	15%	a. Accounting/Business/Management
1	.4%	b. Administration of Justice
0	0%	c. Aviation Maintenance Technology
10	4%	d. Computer Information Science
10	4%	e. Early Childhood Education
6	3%	f. Electronics Technology
13	6%	g. Fire Technology
3	1%	h. Food Service Management
0	0%	i. Foodservice Production/Control
15	6%	j. Horticulture
32	13%	k. Legal Assisting
0	0%	l. Library Technology
2	1%	m. Mechanical-Electrical Technology
19	8%	n. Nursing (R.N.)
0	0%	o. Occupational Therapy Assistant
0	0%	p. Printing Technology
27	11%	q. Real Estate
13	6%	r. Sign Language Studies
48	20%	s. Other (please specify) (Various)
3	1%	Answered Yes but did not specify program

3. In what other types of courses are you enrolled? (Check all that apply.) (Each % based on 663)

55	8%	a. Art
52	8%	b. Biological Sciences (biology, physiology, etc.)
104	16%	c. Business/Computer Science/Management
16	2%	d. Early Childhood Education
22	3%	e. English/Speech
4	1%	f. English as a Second Language
16	2%	g. Family/Consumer Science, Home Economics
54	8%	h. Foreign Language
37	6%	i. Mathematics/Statistics
14	2%	j. Music
30	5%	k. Physical Education
32	5%	l. Physical Sciences (chemistry, physics, etc.)
38	6%	m. Social/Behavioral Science (econ., psych., etc.)
5	1%	n. Theater Arts
64	10%	o. Other (Please specify) (Various)

4. What is your current employment status?

355	54%	a. Employed full-time
126	19%	b. Employed part-time
2	.3%	c. Full-time military service
84	13%	d. Unemployed but seeking work
87	13%	e. Unemployed, not seeking work
9	1%	No Response

5. How many units are you taking this semester?

30	5%	a. 12 or more units
163	25%	b. 6 to 11.5 units
458	69%	c. .5 to 5.5 units
12	2%	No Response

6. When are your classes scheduled?

82	12%	a. During the day (mornings and afternoons)
53	8%	b. Mornings only (begin before 12:00)
25	4%	c. Afternoons only (begin 12:00 or later)
416	63%	d. Evenings only (begin 5:00 p.m. or later)
65	10%	e. Both day and evening
14	2%	f. Weekends (only)
8	1%	No Response

[OVER, PLEASE]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

7. Where do you attend classes? (Check all that apply)
(Each % based on 663 respondents)

579	87%	a. AMERICAN RIVER COLLEGE (Main Campus)
38	6%	b. Natomas Outreach Center
30	5%	c. Sunrise Outreach Center
13	2%	d. McClellan AFB Outreach Center
3	1%	e. Kaiser Hospital
2	.3%	f. Gramercy Court
12	2%	g. Sacramento Fire Dept. Towers
0	0%	h. Mission Oaks Senior Center
3	1%	i. Orange Grove School
5	1%	j. COSUMNES RIVER COLLEGE (Main)
0	0%	k. Placerville Center
2	.3%	l. Folsom/Cordova Outreach Sites
0	0%	m. Mather Outreach Center
16	2%	n. SACRAMENTO CITY COLLEGE (Main)
0	0%	o. Davis Center
5	1%	p. Downtown Center
0	0%	q. West Sacramento Center

8. Please indicate the type of college/university which granted your bachelor's degree:

94	14%	a. University of California
313	47%	b. California State University
50	8%	c. California Independent University
112	17%	d. Out-of-state Public University
70	11%	e. Out-of-state Private University
24	4%	No Response

9. Are your educational expenses offset or reimbursed by your employer?

25	4%	a. Fully paid for/reimbursed
49	7%	b. Partially paid for/reimbursed
408	62%	c. No financial assistance from employer
167	25%	d. Not applicable/not employed
14	2%	No Response

10. Please indicate the approximate total annual income of your household:

23	4%	a. $ 4,999 or less	56	8%	f. $25-$29,999
35	5%	b. $ 5,000-$ 9,999	53	8%	g. $30-$34,999
47	7%	c. $10,000-$14,999	45	7%	h. $35-$39,999
43	7%	d. $15,000-$19,999	259	39%	i. $40,000+
58	9%	e. $20,000-$24,999	44	7%	No Response

11. Students who may be exempt from the new $40 differential fee are described on the enclosed sheet. PLEASE READ THESE DESCRIPTIONS CAREFULLY and indicate if you think you qualify for and plan to apply for one of the exemptions:

35	5%	a. Dislocated worker
19	3%	b. Displaced homemaker
20	3%	c. Student on public assistance (AFDC, SSI, etc.)
6	1%	d. Student paying nonresident tuition
583	88%	No Response

12. Do you plan to reenroll at one of our colleges next semester (Spring 1993)? (18 = 3% No Response)

340	51%	Yes If Yes, for how many units? Avg. = 5
305	46%	No If No, please indicate why: (% based on 305)
33	11%	a. My educational objective will be completed.
174	57%	b. New fees will make college too expensive.
27	9%	c. Plan to "stop out" and reenroll at a later time.
27	9%	d. Will enroll at another school: (% based on 27)
		1 (4%) University of California campus
		22 (82%) California State University campus
		0 (0%) California Independent University
		1 (4%) Public out-of-state university
		0 (0%) Private out-of-state university
		0 (0%) Another California community college
		3 (11%) Other (please specify) (Various)
40	13%	e. Other reasons: (Various)
4	1%	Answered No but did not give reason.

COMMENTS: [If you have any additional comments, add them here.]

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS SURVEY!

[Please return this form in the postage-paid envelope as soon as possible.]

SACRAMENTO CITY COLLEGE AMERICAN RIVER COLLEGE COSUMNES RIVER COLLEGE

American River College
Baccalaureate Student Survey Highlights

•

The district has just completed a special survey of the 4,009 baccalaureate degree students enrolled districtwide in Fall 1992 (about 8% of our student population). The overall response rate for American River College students was 39%, and the ARC respondent population did vary from the survey population with somewhat more women, older and white students among the respondents. In terms of demographics, 76% of respondents were over 30 years old, 66% were women, and 17% were ethnic minorities.

This survey addressed the baccalaureate students' goals and background, and the potential effect of the new $40-per-unit differential fee on their educational plans. Initial findings of the survey for ARC include the following:

- Almost 65% of the baccalaureate students are attending for job-related reasons; 9% are earning transfer units toward a different degree; and 21% are enrolled for personal development.
- More than half (54%) are employed full-time and 19% part-time.
- Surprisingly, 13% are unemployed and seeking work, higher than the unemployment percentage statewide or in the Sacramento region.
- Almost 69% are taking fewer than 6 units, and 63% are attending only during the evenings.
- Almost half (47%) of these students received their baccalaureate degrees from the CSU system and 14% from the UC system. More than a third (36%) received their degrees from either independent (private) or out-of-state institutions.
- Almost two out of three (62%) said their employer provided no financial assistance toward their educational expenses, and only 11% were partially or fully reimbursed.

1919 SPANOS COURT • SACRAMENTO, CA 95825-3981 • 916-568-3021

- In terms of annual household income, 23% of the baccalaureate students reported less than $20,000; in fact, 9% had an annual income of under $10,000. Over 32% reported between $20,000 and $40,000, and 39% $40,000 or more.

- Relatively few (12%) of the students believed they might be eligible for one of the fee exemption categories (5% as dislocated workers, 3% on public assistance, 3% as displaced homemakers, and 1% already paying nonresident tuition).

- Almost half of the students (46%) stated they would not return to one of the Los Rios colleges next semester, the majority (57%) because they felt the new fees would make college too expensive.

Additional analyses of the survey information have been completed, and results by district and college are available upon request. A previous analysis of the baccalaureate students' course-taking patterns and demographics was produced by the district's Office of Planning and Research and is available both by district and by college.

Los Rios Community College District
Office of Planning and Research
November 16, 1992

COMPARISON OF BA+ STUDENTS' COURSE-TAKING PATTERNS
Fall 1992-Spring 1993

AMERICAN RIVER COLLEGE

The following summary shows the "top ten/eleven" departments in terms of BA+ student enrollments in Fall 1992 and Spring 1993 (percentages are of all BA+ course enrollments). The last two columns show the net "loss" in individual enrollments, followed by the percentage loss compared to the previous semester. Departments are listed in order of percentage loss in enrollments in Spring 1993 compared to Fall 1992.

	Fall 1992		Spring 1993		Loss in Enrollments	% Loss From Fall 1992
TOTALS (all BA+ courses)	**2,862**	**100%**	**1,708**	**100%**	**-1,154**	**-40.3%**
▸ PE/Recreation	172	6.0%	61	3.6%	- 111	-64.5%
▸ Spanish**	108	3.8%	48	2.8%	- 60	-55.6%
▸ Real Estate	124	4.3%	57	3.3%	- 67	-54.0%
▸ Mathematics	109	3.8%	53	3.1%	- 56	-51.4%
▸ Computer Info Science	232	8.1%	135	7.9%	- 97	-41.8%
▸ Management	127	4.4%	79	4.6%	- 48	-37.8%
▸ Accounting	89	3.1%	57	3.3%	- 32	-36.0%
▸ Art	159	5.6%	111	6.5%	- 48	-30.2%
▸ Horticulture	106	3.7%	80	4.7%	- 26	-24.5%
▸ Interior Design*	59	2.1%	57	3.3%	- 2	-3.4%
▸ Chemistry	112	3.9%	109	6.4%	- 3	- 2.7%
▸ Biology	179	6.3%	157	9.2%	- 22	- 1.1%

*Not in Fall '92 Top 10
**Not in Spring '93 Top 10

AMERICAN RIVER COLLEGE
ALL STUDENTS—SPRING 92 AND SPRING 93

Demographics & Other Characteristics		%		Number		Net Change		
		Spring 92	Spring 93	Spring 92	Spring 93	% Pts	Number	% Chg
TOTAL STUDENTS		100.0	100.0	21,330	19,023	0.0	-2,307	-10.8
GENDER	Women	55.4	55.1	11,815	10,464	-0.3	-1,351	-11.4
	Men	44.6	44.9	9,515	8,535	0.3	-980	-10.3
	Unknown			3	24		21	
ETHNICITY	African American	6.2	6.4	1,330	1,211	0.2	-119	-9.0
	American Indian	2.5	2.4	540	463	-0.1	-77	-14.3
	Asian	5.8	6.2	1,237	1,180	0.4	-57	-4.6
	Caucasian	72.4	70.5	15,434	13,417	-1.9	-2,017	-13.1
	Filipino	1.5	1.8	323	332	0.3	9	2.8
	Latino	7.9	8.2	1,679	1,559	0.3	-120	-7.2
	Other	2.9	3.8	611	714	0.9	103	16.9
	Unknown (No Code)	0.8	0.8	179	147	0.0	-32	-17.9
AGE GROUP	Under 18	1.1	0.9	230	173	-0.2	-57	-24.8
	18 to 20	24.1	24.9	5,145	4,727	0.8	-418	-8.1
	21 to 24	23.5	24.1	5,004	4,590	0.6	-414	-8.3
	25 to 29	16.5	16.1	3,525	3,067	-0.4	-458	-13.0
	30 to 39	20.7	20.3	4,419	3,862	-0.4	-557	-12.6
	40 or older	14.1	13.7	3,010	2,604	-0.4	-406	-13.5
	30 or older	34.8	34.0	7,429	6,466	-0.8	-963	-13.0
DAY EVENING	Both Day/Evening	16.1	16.5	3,430	3,130	0.4	-300	-8.8
	Day only	46.8	48.5	9,977	9,220	1.7	-757	-7.6
	Evening only	37.2	35.1	7,926	6,673	-2.1	-1,253	-15.8
UNIT LOAD	Full time (12+)	21.3	21.5	4,547	4,086	0.2	-461	-10.1
	Mid (6-11.5)	33.7	34.9	7,180	6,632	1.2	-548	-7.6
	Light (.5-5.5)	45.0	43.6	9,606	8,300	-1.4	-1,306	-13.6
	Average number/units			6.96	7.02		+.06	
EDUCATIONAL GOAL	Transfer/no AA	21.5	20.2	4,386	3,719	-1.3	-667	-15.2
	Transfer/with AA	43.1	42.4	8,783	7,828	-0.7	-955	-10.9
	Vocational AA	7.2	7.2	1,463	1,330	0.0	-133	-9.1
	General Education AA	3.3	2.9	680	527	-0.4	-153	-22.5
	Vocational Certificate	6.1	5.4	1,233	1,000	-0.7	-233	-18.9
	Acquire Job Skill	4.1	2.8	842	523	-1.3	-319	-37.9
	Upgrade Job Skill	6.7	5.0	1,369	925	-1.7	-444	-32.4
	No AA/certificate goal	8.0	14.1	1,640	2,602	6.1	962	58.7
ENROLLMENT STATUS	New, never attended	7.9	8.3	1,677	1,582	0.4	-95	-5.7
	New, attended 2 yr	6.8	6.2	1,443	1,182	-0.6	-261	-18.1
	New, attended 4 yr	5.7	3.9	1,215	746	-1.8	-469	-38.6
	Returning (prev. LR)	12.0	7.9	2,555	1,504	-4.1	-1,051	-41.1
	Returning (@ 2 yr)	2.1	1.8	443	334	-0.3	-109	-24.6
	Returning (@ 4 yr)	2.8	1.8	589	334	-1.0	-255	-43.3
	High School Student	0.5	0.4	96	80	-0.1	-16	-16.7
	Continuing	62.4	69.7	13,315	13,248	7.3	-67	-0.5

TABLE\ALLSS.ARC

AMERICAN RIVER COLLEGE
BA+ STUDENTS—SPRING 92 AND SPRING 93

Demographics & Other Characteristics		%		Number		Net Change		
		Spring 92	Spring 93	Spring 92	Spring 93	% Pts	Number	% Chg
TOTAL STUDENTS		100.0	100.0	1,878	974	0.0	-904	-48.1
GENDER	Women	59.4	62.3	1,115	607	2.9	-508	-45.6
	Men	40.6	37.6	763	366	-3.0	-397	-52.0
	Unknown			0	1		1	
ETHNICITY	African American	4.1	4.2	76	41	0.1	-35	-46.1
	American Indian	1.9	1.4	36	14	-0.5	-22	-61.1
	Asian	5.6	5.8	106	56	0.2	-50	-47.2
	Caucasian	78.0	77.8	1,464	758	-0.2	-706	-48.2
	Filipino	1.5	2.1	29	20	0.6	-9	-31.0
	Latino	4.8	4.4	90	43	-0.4	-47	-52.2
	Other	3.3	3.4	61	33	0.1	-28	-45.9
	Unknown (No Code)	0.9	0.9	16	9	0.0	-7	-43.8
AGE GROUP	Under 18	0.0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0	
	18 to 20	0.1	0.0	2	0	-0.1	-2	-100.0
	21 to 24	10.9	6.8	204	66	-4.1	-138	-67.7
	25 to 29	19.3	18.8	363	183	-0.5	-180	-49.6
	30 to 39	31.4	33.0	590	321	1.6	-269	-45.6
	40 or older	38.3	41.5	719	404	3.2	-315	-43.8
	30 or older	69.7	74.5	1,309	725	4.8	-584	-44.6
DAY EVENING	Both Day/Evening	9.2	9.6	173	93	0.4	-80	-46.2
	Day only	24.3	28.3	457	276	4.0	-181	-39.6
	Evening only	66.5	62.1	1,248	605	-4.4	-643	-51.5
UNIT LOAD	Full time (12+)	3.1	4.1	59	40	1.0	-19	-32.2
	Mid (6-11.5)	18.6	20.9	349	204	2.3	-145	-41.6
	Light (.5-5.5)	78.3	75.0	1,470	730	-3.3	-740	-50.3
	Average number/units			4.04	4.27		+.23	
EDUCATIONAL GOAL	Transfer/no AA	8.9	11.2	160	105	2.3	-55	-34.4
	Transfer/with AA	5.5	4.4	99	41	-1.1	-58	-58.6
	Vocational AA	4.2	5.2	76	49	1.0	-27	-35.5
	General Education AA	1.1	1.4	20	13	0.3	-7	-35.0
	Vocational Certificate	8.3	11.1	148	104	2.8	-44	-29.7
	Acquire Job Skill	12.4	10.5	223	99	-1.9	-124	-55.6
	Upgrade Job Skill	31.3	25.6	561	241	-5.7	-320	-57.0
	No AA/certificate goal	28.3	30.6	508	288	2.3	-220	-43.3
ENROLLMENT STATUS	New, never attended	0.2	4.3	4	17	4.1	13	325.0
	New, attended 2 yr	0.0	5.1	0	20	5.1	20	
	New, attended 4 yr	30.7	49.1	577	194	18.4	-383	-66.4
	Returning (prev. LR)	11.3	15.4	212	61	4.1	-151	-71.2
	Returning (@ 2 yr)	0.0	2.3	0	9	2.3	9	
	Returning (@ 4 yr)	14.1	23.8	265	94	9.7	-171	-64.5
	High School Student	0.0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0	
	Continuing	43.7	60.5	820	579	16.8	-241	-29.4

TABLE\BASS.ARC

APPENDIX

Cosumnes River College

Questionnaire and Responses to BA+ Student Survey—Fall 1992

Highlights of BA+ Student Survey (Fall 1992)

Comparison of College BA+ Students' Course-Taking Patterns (Fall 1992-Spring 1993)

Chart of All Student Characteristics—Spring 1992 & Spring 1993

Chart of BA+ Student Characteristics—Spring 1992 & Spring 1993

LOS RIOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

SURVEY OF BACCALAUREATE DEGREE STUDENTS

COSUMNES RIVER COLLEGE FIGURES
(N = 237)

AMERICAN RIVER COLLEGE

COSUMNES RIVER COLLEGE
CRC/PLACERVILLE CENTER

SACRAMENTO CITY COLLEGE

DEAR STUDENT: Your answers to the following questions will help us to schedule courses to meet your needs. (Unless otherwise noted, please check only one response for each item.)

1. What is your MOST IMPORTANT reason for attending our college? (Check only one.)

75	32%	a. To acquire skills for new job/career
55	23%	b. To upgrade skills for present career field
12	5%	c. To maintain certificate or license
5	2%	d. To improve basic skills in English/reading/math
19	8%	e. To earn transferable units for another degree
65	27%	f. For personal interest/educational development
6	3%	g. Other (please describe) (Various)
0	0%	No Response

2. Are you enrolled in an occupational major program?

Yes 61 26% No 173 73% NR 3 1%

If Yes, which program? (Check only one.)
(% based on 61 who answered Yes)

11	18%	a. Accounting/Business/Management
0	0%	b. Administration of Justice
0	0%	c. Aviation Maintenance Technology
6	10%	d. Computer Information Science
4	7%	e. Early Childhood Education
1	2%	f. Electronics Technology
2	3%	g. Fire Technology
0	0%	h. Food Service Management
1	2%	i. Foodservice Production/Control
0	0%	j. Horticulture
0	0%	k. Legal Assisting
0	0%	l. Library Technology
2	3%	m. Mechanical-Electrical Technology
6	10%	n. Nursing (R.N.)
0	0%	o. Occupational Therapy Assistant
0	0%	p. Printing Technology
6	10%	q. Real Estate
1	2%	r. Sign Language Studies
20	33%	s. Other (please specify) (Various)
1	2%	Answered Yes but did not specify program

3. In what other types of courses are you enrolled? (Check all that apply.) (Each % based on 237)

16	7%	a. Art
16	7%	b. Biological Sciences (biology, physiology, etc.)
36	15%	c. Business/Computer Science/Management
3	1%	d. Early Childhood Education
8	3%	e. English/Speech
1	.4%	f. English as a Second Language
4	2%	g. Family/Consumer Science, Home Economics
7	3%	h. Foreign Language
14	6%	i. Mathematics/Statistics
10	4%	j. Music
25	11%	k. Physical Education
10	4%	l. Physical Sciences (chemistry, physics, etc.)
10	4%	m. Social/Behavioral Science (econ., psych., etc.)
0	0%	n. Theater Arts
26	11%	o. Other (Please specify) (Various)

4. What is your current employment status?

143	60%	a. Employed full-time
37	16%	b. Employed part-time
0	0%	c. Full-time military service
20	8%	d. Unemployed but seeking work
35	15%	e. Unemployed, not seeking work
2	1%	No Response

5. How many units are you taking this semester?

9	4%	a. 12 or more units
41	17%	b. 6 to 11.5 units
185	78%	c. .5 to 5.5 units
2	1%	No Response

6. When are your classes scheduled?

21	9%	a. During the day (mornings and afternoons)
15	6%	b. Mornings only (begin before 12:00)
13	6%	c. Afternoons only (begin 12:00 or later)
166	70%	d. Evenings only (begin 5:00 p.m. or later)
18	8%	e. Both day and evening
3	1%	f. Weekends (only)
1	.4%	No Response

[OVER, PLEASE]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

7. Where do you attend classes? (Check all that apply)
(Each % based on 237 respondents)

12	5%	a. AMERICAN RIVER COLLEGE (Main Campus)
0	0%	b. Natomas Outreach Center
0	0%	c. Sunrise Outreach Center
0	0%	d. McClellan AFB Outreach Center
0	0%	e. Kaiser Hospital
0	0%	f. Gramercy Court
0	0%	g. Sacramento Fire Dept. Towers
0	0%	h. Mission Oaks Senior Center
0	0%	i. Orange Grove School
197	83%	j. COSUMNES RIVER COLLEGE (Main)
2	1%	k. Placerville Center
29	12%	l. Folsom/Cordova Outreach Sites
12	5%	m. Mather Outreach Center
11	5%	n. SACRAMENTO CITY COLLEGE (Main)
0	0%	o. Davis Center
2	1%	p. Downtown Center
0	0%	q. West Sacramento Center

8. Please indicate the type of college/university which granted your bachelor's degree:

36	15%	a. University of California
110	46%	b. California State University
20	8%	c. California Independent University
46	19%	d. Out-of-state Public University
20	8%	e. Out-of-state Private University
5	2%	No Response

9. Are your educational expenses offset or reimbursed by your employer?

12	5%	a. Fully paid for/reimbursed
13	6%	b. Partially paid for/reimbursed
158	67%	c. No financial assistance from employer
52	22%	d. Not applicable/not employed
2	1%	No Response

10. Please indicate the approximate total annual income of your household:

2	1%	a. $ 4,999 or less	22	9%	f. $25-$29,999
9	4%	b. $ 5,000-$ 9,999	21	9%	g. $30-$34,999
11	5%	c. $10,000-$14,999	29	12%	h. $35-$39,999
17	7%	d. $15,000-$19,999	91	38%	i. $40,000+
20	8%	e. $20,000-$24,999	15	6%	No Response

11. Students who may be exempt from the new $40 differential fee are described on the enclosed sheet. PLEASE READ THESE DESCRIPTIONS CAREFULLY and indicate if you think you qualify for and plan to apply for one of the exemptions:

17	7%	a. Dislocated worker
4	2%	b. Displaced homemaker
7	3%	c. Student on public assistance (AFDC, SSI, etc.)
2	1%	d. Student paying nonresident tuition
207	87%	No Response

12. Do you plan to reenroll at one of our colleges next semester (Spring 1993)? (4 = 2% No Response)

116	49%	Yes If Yes, for how many units? Avg. = 5
117	49%	No If No, please indicate why: (% based on 117)
9	8%	a. My educational objective will be completed.
77	66%	b. New fees will make college too expensive.
8	7%	c. Plan to "stop out" and reenroll at a later time.
9	8%	d. Will enroll at another school: (% based on 9)

- 3 (33%) University of California campus
- 4 (44%) California State University campus
- 0 (0%) California Independent University
- 0 (0%) Public out-of-state university
- 0 (0%) Private out-of-state university
- 0 (0%) Another California community college
- 2 (22%) Other (please specify) (Various)

13	11%	e. Other reasons: (Various)
1	1%	Answered No but did not give reason.

COMMENTS: [If you have any additional comments, add them here.]

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS SURVEY!

[Please return this form in the postage-paid envelope as soon as possible.]

Cosumnes River College
Baccalaureate Student Survey Highlights

The district has just completed a special survey of the 4,009 baccalaureate degree students enrolled districtwide in Fall 1992 (about 8% of our student population). The overall response rate for Cosumnes River College students was 33%, and the CRC respondent population did vary from the survey population with somewhat more women, older and white students among the respondents. In terms of demographics, 79% of respondents were over 30 years old, 59% were women, and 31% were ethnic minorities.

This survey addressed the baccalaureate students' goals and background, and the potential effect of the new $40-per-unit differential fee on their educational plans. Initial findings of the survey for CRC include the following:

- Almost 60% of the baccalaureate students are attending for job-related reasons; 8% are earning transfer units toward a different degree; and 27% are enrolled for personal development.
- Sixty percent are employed full-time and 16% part-time.
- Surprisingly, 8% are unemployed and seeking work, somewhat lower than the unemployment percentage statewide or in the Sacramento region.
- Almost 78% are taking fewer than 6 units, and 70% are attending only during the evenings.
- Almost half (46%) of these students received their baccalaureate degrees from the CSU system and 15% from the UC system. More than a third (35%) received their degrees from either independent (private) or out-of-state institutions.
- Two out of three (67%) said their employer provided no financial assistance toward their educational expenses, and only 11% were partially or fully reimbursed.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1919 SPANOS COURT • SACRAMENTO, CA 95825-3981 • 916-568-3021

- In terms of annual household income, 17% of the baccalaureate students reported less than $20,000; in fact, 5% had an annual income of under $10,000. Over 38% reported between $20,000 and $40,000, and 38% $40,000 or more.

- Relatively few (13%) of the students believed they might be eligible for one of the fee exemption categories (7% as dislocated workers, 3% on public assistance, 2% as displaced homemakers, and 1% already paying nonresident tuition).

- Almost half of the students (49%) stated they would not return to one of the Los Rios colleges next semester, the great majority (66%) because they felt the new fees would make college too expensive.

Additional analyses of the survey information have been completed, and results by district and college are available upon request. A previous analysis of the baccalaureate students' course-taking patterns and demographics was produced by the district's Office of Planning and Research and is available both by district and by college.

Los Rios Community College District
Office of Planning and Research
November 16, 1992

COMPARISON OF BA+ STUDENTS' COURSE-TAKING PATTERNS
Fall 1992-Spring 1993

COSUMNES RIVER COLLEGE

The following summary shows the "top ten/eleven" departments in terms of BA+ student enrollments in Fall 1992 and Spring 1993 (percentages are of all BA+ course enrollments). The last two columns show the net "loss" in individual enrollments, followed by the percentage loss compared to the previous semester. Departments are listed in order of percentage loss in enrollments in Spring 1993 compared to Fall 1992.

	Fall 1992		Spring 1993		Loss in Enrollments	% Loss From Fall 1992
TOTALS (all BA+ courses)	**1,113**	**100%**	**710**	**100%**	**-403**	**-36.2%**
▸ Accounting	70	6.3%	27	3.8%	- 43	-61.4%
▸ Computer Info Science	143	12.8%	59	8.3%	- 84	-58.7%
▸ PE/Recreation	131	11.8%	59	8.3%	- 72	-55.0%
▸ Business**	33	3.0%	15	2.1%	- 18	-54.5%
▸ Spanish**	39	3.5%	21	3.0%	- 18	-46.2%
▸ Real Estate	44	4.0%	25	3.5%	- 19	-43.2%
▸ Art	37	3.3%	27	3.8%	- 10	-27.0%
▸ Photography	37	3.3%	27	3.8%	- 10	-27.0%
▸ Chemistry	34	3.1%	26	3.7%	- 8	-23.5%
▸ Music-Instrumental/Voice*	32	2.9%	25	3.5%	- 7	-21.9%
▸ Animal Health Tech*	24	2.2%	26	3.7%	+ 2	+ 8.3%
▸ Biology	70	6.3%	84	11.8%	+ 14	+20.0%

*Not in Fall '92 Top Ten
**Not in Spring '93 Top 10

COSUMNES RIVER COLLEGE
ALL STUDENTS—SPRING 92 AND SPRING 93

Demographics & Other Characteristics		%		Number		Net Change		
		Spring 92	Spring 93	Spring 92	Spring 93	% Pts	Number	% Chg
TOTAL STUDENTS		100.0	100.0	9,323	8,944	0.0	-379	-4.1
GENDER	Women	56.3	56.8	5,244	5,064	0.5	-180	-3.4
	Men	43.7	43.2	4,064	3,853	-0.5	-211	-5.2
	Unknown			15	27		-12	
ETHNICITY	African American	13.6	12.2	1,268	1,089	-1.4	-179	-14.1
	American Indian	2.1	2.1	195	189	0.0	-6	-3.1
	Asian	12.1	14.2	1,132	1,266	2.1	134	11.8
	Caucasian	52.6	49.8	4,904	4,456	-2.8	-448	-9.1
	Filipino	4.4	4.7	414	424	0.3	10	2.4
	Latino	10.6	10.9	991	976	0.3	-15	-1.5
	Other	3.4	4.4	321	389	1.0	68	21.2
	Unknown (No Code)	1.1	1.7	98	155	0.6	57	58.2
AGE GROUP	Under 18	1.8	2.3	170	201	0.5	31	18.2
	18 to 20	21.6	25.0	2,010	2,234	3.4	224	11.1
	21 to 24	18.4	19.5	1,711	1,743	1.1	32	1.9
	25 to 29	15.9	14.7	1,484	1,315	-1.2	-169	-11.4
	30 to 39	24.9	22.2	2,322	1,982	-2.7	-340	-14.6
	40 or older	17.4	16.4	1,626	1,469	-1.0	-157	-9.7
	30 or older	42.3	38.6	3,948	3,451	-3.7	-497	-12.6
DAY EVENING	Both Day/Evening	16.8	18.4	1,563	1,641	1.6	78	5.0
	Day only	35.3	38.4	3,290	3,435	3.1	145	4.4
	Evening only	48.0	43.3	4,470	3,868	-4.7	-602	-13.5
UNIT LOAD	Full time (12+)	17.6	20.7	1,636	1,855	3.1	219	13.4
	Mid (6-11.5)	29.7	30.6	2,771	2,738	0.9	-33	-1.2
	Light (.5-5.5)	52.7	48.6	4,916	4,350	-4.1	-566	-11.5
	Average number/units			6.41	6.87		+.46	
EDUCATIONAL GOAL	Transfer/no AA	16.4	15.3	1,528	1,362	-1.1	-166	-10.9
	Transfer/with AA	36.1	34.8	3,363	3,104	-1.3	-259	-7.7
	Vocational AA	5.5	5.4	513	478	-0.1	-35	-6.8
	General Education AA	4.5	2.7	418	237	-1.8	-181	-43.3
	Vocational Certificate	5.5	3.8	512	339	-1.7	-173	-33.8
	Acquire Job Skill	5.5	3.6	512	321	-1.9	-191	-37.3
	Upgrade Job Skill	10.0	6.0	927	534	-4.0	-393	-42.4
	No AA/certificate goal	16.5	28.5	1,535	2,544	12.0	1,009	65.7
ENROLLMENT STATUS	New, never attended	10.6	14.0	988	1,249	3.4	261	26.4
	New, attended 2 yr	8.9	9.6	832	855	0.7	23	2.8
	New, attended 4 yr	6.4	3.6	593	325	-2.8	-268	-45.2
	Returning (prev. LR)	13.7	10.7	1,276	954	-3.0	-322	-25.2
	Returning (@ 2 yr)	4.1	2.4	385	212	-1.7	-173	-44.9
	Returning (@ 4 yr)	2.4	0.9	223	77	-1.5	-146	-65.5
	High School Student	1.0	1.2	96	110	0.2	14	14.6
	Continuing	52.9	57.7	4,928	5,160	4.8	232	4.7

TABLE\ALLSS.CRC

COSUMNES RIVER COLLEGE
BA+ STUDENTS—SPRING 92 AND SPRING 93

Demographics & Other Characteristics		%		Number		Net Change		
		Spring 92	Spring 93	Spring 92	Spring 93	% Pts	Number	% Chg
TOTAL STUDENTS		100.0	100.0	898	451	0.0	-447	-49.8
GENDER	Women	53.7	59.4	482	268	5.7	-214	-44.4
	Men	46.3	40.6	416	183	-5.7	-233	-56.0
	Unknown			0	0		0	
ETHNICITY	African American	8.1	4.4	73	20	-3.7	-53	-72.6
	American Indian	0.8	1.8	7	8	1.0	1	14.3
	Asian	12.3	13.5	110	61	1.2	-49	-44.6
	Caucasian	64.5	65.6	579	296	1.1	-283	-48.9
	Filipino	3.3	3.8	30	17	0.5	-13	-43.3
	Latino	7.2	3.8	65	17	-3.4	-48	-73.9
	Other	3.3	4.2	30	19	0.9	-11	-36.7
	Unknown (No Code)	0.5	2.9	4	13	2.4	9	225.0
AGE GROUP	Under 18	0.1	0.0	1	0	-0.1	-1	-100.0
	18 to 20	0.3	0.0	3	0	-0.3	-3	-100.0
	21 to 24	10.4	6.4	93	29	-4.0	-64	-68.8
	25 to 29	20.2	19.3	181	87	-0.9	-94	-51.9
	30 to 39	37.1	34.8	333	157	-2.3	-176	-52.9
	40 or older	32.0	39.5	287	178	7.5	-109	-38.0
	30 or older	69.1	74.3	620	335	5.2	-285	-46.0
DAY EVENING	Both Day/Evening	8.1	10.0	73	45	1.9	-28	-38.4
	Day only	18.2	30.4	163	137	12.2	-26	-16.0
	Evening only	73.7	59.7	662	269	-14.0	-393	-59.4
UNIT LOAD	Full time (12+)	1.5	1.6	13	7	0.1	-6	-46.2
	Mid (6-11.5)	13.0	14.4	117	65	1.4	-52	-44.4
	Light (.5-5.5)	85.5	84.0	768	379	-1.5	-389	-50.7
	Average number/units			3.41	3.58		+.17	
EDUCATIONAL GOAL	Transfer/no AA	5.5	7.5	49	34	2.0	-15	-30.6
	Transfer/with AA	3.9	2.7	35	12	-1.2	-23	-65.7
	Vocational AA	2.6	4.0	23	18	1.4	-5	-21.7
	General Education AA	0.8	0.9	7	4	0.1	-3	-42.9
	Vocational Certificate	5.8	6.0	52	27	0.2	-25	-48.1
	Acquire Job Skill	10.7	7.1	96	32	-3.6	-64	-66.7
	Upgrade Job Skill	33.7	17.3	303	78	-16.4	-225	-74.3
	No AA/certificate goal	37.1	54.6	333	246	17.5	-87	-26.1
ENROLLMENT STATUS	New, never attended	0.6	6.9	5	31	6.3	26	520.0
	New, attended 2 yr	0.0	2.9	0	13	2.9	13	
	New, attended 4 yr	36.3	24.0	326	108	-12.3	-218	-66.9
	Returning (prev. LR)	14.2	11.5	127	52	-2.7	-75	-59.1
	Returning (@ 2 yr)	0.0	1.6	0	7	1.6	7	
	Returning (@ 4 yr)	11.5	5.3	103	24	-6.2	-79	-76.7
	High School Student	0.0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0	
	Continuing	37.5	47.9	336	216	10.4	-120	-35.7

TABLE9BASS.CRC

APPENDIX

Cosmunes River College/Placerville Center

Questionnaire and Responses to BA+ Student Survey—Fall 1992

Highlights of BA+ Student Survey (Fall 1992)

Comparison of College BA+ Students' Course-Taking Patterns (Fall 1992-Spring 1993)

Chart of All Student Characteristics—Spring 1992 & Spring 1993

Chart of BA+ Student Characteristics—Spring 1992 & Spring 1993

LOS RIOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

SURVEY OF BACCALAUREATE DEGREE STUDENTS

CRC/PLACERVILLE CENTER FIGURES
(N = 58)

AMERICAN RIVER COLLEGE

COSUMNES RIVER COLLEGE
CRC/PLACERVILLE CENTER

SACRAMENTO CITY COLLEGE

DEAR STUDENT: Your answers to the following questions will help us to schedule courses to meet your needs. (Unless otherwise noted, please check only one response for each item.)

1. What is your MOST IMPORTANT reason for attending our college? (Check only one.)

17	29%	a. To acquire skills for new job/career
8	14%	b. To upgrade skills for present career field
0	0%	c. To maintain certificate or license
0	0%	d. To improve basic skills in English/reading/math
2	3%	e. To earn transferable units for another degree
28	48%	f. For personal interest/educational development
3	5%	g. Other (please describe) (Various)
0	0%	No Response

2. Are you enrolled in an occupational major program?

Yes 9 15% No 49 85% NR 0 0%

If Yes, which program? (Check only one.)
(% based on 9 who answered Yes)

4	44%	a. Accounting/Business/Management
1	11%	b. Administration of Justice
0	0%	c. Aviation Maintenance Technology
1	11%	d. Computer Information Science
1	11%	e. Early Childhood Education
0	0%	f. Electronics Technology
0	0%	g. Fire Technology
0	0%	h. Food Service Management
0	0%	i. Foodservice Production/Control
0	0%	j. Horticulture
0	0%	k. Legal Assisting
0	0%	l. Library Technology
0	0%	m. Mechanical-Electrical Technology
0	9%	n. Nursing (R.N.)
0	0%	o. Occupational Therapy Assistant
0	0%	p. Printing Technology
0	0%	q. Real Estate
0	0%	r. Sign Language Studies
2	22%	s. Other (please specify) (Various)
0	0%	Answered Yes but did not specify program

3. In what other types of courses are you enrolled? (Check all that apply.) (Each % based on 58)

7	12%	a. Art
1	2%	b. Biological Sciences (biology, physiology, etc.)
5	9%	c. Business/Computer Science/Management
0	0%	d. Early Childhood Education
0	0%	e. English/Speech
0	0%	f. English as a Second Language
0	0%	g. Family/Consumer Science, Home Economics
4	7%	h. Foreign Language
3	5%	i. Mathematics/Statistics
1	2%	j. Music
11	19%	k. Physical Education
0	0%	l. Physical Sciences (chemistry, physics, etc.)
0	0%	m. Social/Behavioral Science (econ., psych., etc.)
0	0%	n. Theater Arts
6	10%	o. Other (Please specify) (Various)

4. What is your current employment status?

26	45%	a. Employed full-time
15	26%	b. Employed part-time
1	2%	c. Full-time military service1
7	12%	d. Unemployed but seeking work
8	14%	e. Unemployed, not seeking work
1	2%	No Response

5. How many units are you taking this semester?

0	0%	a. 12 or more units
8	14%	b. 6 to 11.5 units
49	85%	c. .5 to 5.5 units
1	2%	No Response

6. When are your classes scheduled?

6	10%	a. During the day (mornings and afternoons)
5	9%	b. Mornings only (begin before 12:00)
3	5%	c. Afternoons only (begin 12:00 or later)
35	60%	d. Evenings only (begin 5:00 p.m. or later)
6	10%	e. Both day and evening
3	5%	f. Weekends (only)
0	0%	No Response

[OVER, PLEASE]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

7. Where do you attend classes? (Check all that apply)
(Each % based on 58 respondents)

1	2%	a. AMERICAN RIVER COLLEGE (Main Campus)
0	0%	b. Natomas Outreach Center
0	0%	c. Sunrise Outreach Center
0	0%	d. McClellan AFB Outreach Center
0	0%	e. Kaiser Hospital
0	0%	f. Gramercy Court
0	0%	g. Sacramento Fire Dept. Towers
0	0%	h. Mission Oaks Senior Center
0	0%	i. Orange Grove School
3	5%	j. COSUMNES RIVER COLLEGE (Main)
55	95%	k. Placerville Center
1	2%	l. Folsom/Cordova Outreach Sites
1	2%	m. Mather Outreach Center
0	0%	n. SACRAMENTO CITY COLLEGE (Main)
0	0%	o. Davis Center
1	2%	p. Downtown Center
0	0%	q. West Sacramento Center

8. Please indicate the type of college/university which granted your bachelor's degree:

3	5%	a. University of California
35	60%	b. California State University
6	10%	c. California Independent University
9	16%	d. Out-of-state Public University
4	7%	e. Out-of-state Private University
1	2%	No Response

9. Are your educational expenses offset or reimbursed by your employer?

1	2%	a. Fully paid for/reimbursed
1	2%	b. Partially paid for/reimbursed
37	64%	c. No financial assistance from employer
19	33%	d. Not applicable/not employed
0	0%	No Response

10. Please indicate the approximate total annual income of your household:

3	5%	a. $ 4,999 or less	2	3%	f. $25-$29,999
2	3%	b. $ 5,000-$ 9,999	3	5%	g. $30-$34,999
2	3%	c. $10,000-$14,999	10	17%	h. $35-$39,999
4	7%	d. $15,000-$19,999	24	41%	i. $40,000+
5	9%	e. $20,000-$24,999	3	5%	No Response

11. Students who may be exempt from the new $40 differential fee are described on the enclosed sheet. PLEASE READ THESE DESCRIPTIONS CAREFULLY and indicate if you think you qualify for and plan to apply for one of the exemptions:

4	7%	a. Dislocated worker
1	2%	b. Displaced homemaker
1	2%	c. Student on public assistance (AFDC, SSI, etc.)
0	0%	d. Student paying nonresident tuition
52	90%	No Response

12. Do you plan to reenroll at one of our colleges next semester (Spring 1993)? (1 = 2% No Response)

22	38%	Yes If Yes, for how many units? Avg. = 3.5
35	60%	No If No, please indicate why: (% based on 35)
1	3%	a. My educational objective will be completed.
24	69%	b. New fees will make college too expensive.
3	9%	c. Plan to "stop out" and reenroll at a later time.
0	0%	d. Will enroll at another school: (% based on 0)
		0 (0%) University of California campus
		0 (0%) California State University campus
		0 (0%) California Independent University
		0 (0%) Public out-of-state university
		0 (0%) Private out-of-state university
		0 (0%) Another California community college
		0 (0%) Other (please specify) (Various)
7	20%	e. Other reasons: (Various)
0	0%	Answered No but did not give reason.

COMMENTS: [If you have any additional comments, add them here.]

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS SURVEY!

[Please return this form in the postage-paid envelope as soon as possible.]

SACRAMENTO CITY COLLEGE AMERICAN RIVER COLLEGE COSUMNES RIVER COLLEGE

CRC/Placerville Center
Baccalaureate Student Survey Highlights

The district has just completed a special survey of the 4,009 baccalaureate degree students enrolled districtwide in Fall 1992 (about 8% of our student population). The overall response rate for CRC/Placerville Center students was 37%, and the CRC/P respondent population did vary from the survey population with somewhat more women, older and white students among the respondents. In terms of demographics, 91% of respondents were over 30 years old, 67% were women, and 9% were ethnic minorities. (Due to having only 58 respondents, percentages should be used with great caution.)

This survey addressed the baccalaureate students' goals and background, and the potential effect of the new $40-per-unit differential fee on their educational plans. Initial findings of the survey for CRC/P include the following:

- Fewer than half (43%) of the baccalaureate students are attending for job-related reasons; 3% are earning transfer units toward a different degree; and 48% are enrolled for personal development.
- Almost half (45%) are employed full-time and 26% part-time.
- Surprisingly, 12% are unemployed and seeking work, somewhat higher than the unemployment percentage statewide or in the Sacramento region.
- Eighty-five percent are taking fewer than 6 units, and 60% are attending only during the evenings.
- Almost two-thirds (60%) of these students received their baccalaureate degrees from the CSU system and 5% from the UC system. A third (33%) received their degrees from either independent (private) or out-of-state institutions.
- Almost two out of three (64%) said their employer provided no financial assistance toward their educational expenses, and only 4% were partially or fully reimbursed.

1919 SPANOS COURT • SACRAMENTO, CA 95825-3981 • 916-568-3021

- In terms of annual household income, 18% of the baccalaureate students reported less than $20,000; in fact, 8% had an annual income of under $10,000. Almost 34% reported between $20,000 and $40,000, and 41% $40,000 or more.

- Relatively few (11%) of the students believed they might be eligible for one of the fee exemption categories (7% as dislocated workers, 2% on public assistance, and 2% as displaced homemakers).

- More than half of the students (60%) stated they would not return to one of the Los Rios colleges next semester, the great majority (69%) because they felt the new fees would make college too expensive.

Additional analyses of the survey information have been completed, and results by district and college are available upon request. A previous analysis of the baccalaureate students' course-taking patterns and demographics was produced by the district's Office of Planning and Research and is available both by district and by college.

Los Rios Community College District
Office of Planning and Research
November 16, 1992

COMPARISON OF BA+ STUDENTS' COURSE-TAKING PATTERNS
Fall 1992-Spring 1993

CRC/PLACERVILLE

The following summary shows the "top ten/eleven" departments in terms of BA+ student enrollments in Fall 1992 and Spring 1993 (percentages are of all BA+ course enrollments). The last two columns show the net "loss" in individual enrollments, followed by the percentage loss compared to the previous semester. Departments are listed in order of percentage loss in enrollments in Spring 1993 compared to Fall 1992.

	Fall 1992		Spring 1993		Loss in Enrollments	% Loss From Fall 1992
TOTALS (all BA+ courses)	**190**	**100%**	**100**	**100%**	**-90**	**-47.4%**
▸ Journalism**	13	6.8%	0	0.0%	- 13	-100.0%
▸ French**	7	3.7%	1	1.0%	- 6	-85.7%
▸ Human Services**	7	3.7%	2	2.0%	- 5	-71.4%
▸ Business	13	6.8%	4	4.0%	- 9	-69.2%
▸ Art	26	13.7%	12	12.0%	- 14	-53.8%
▸ English	8	4.2%	4	4.0%	- 4	-50.0%
▸ Accounting	13	6.8%	7	7.0%	- 6	-46.2%
▸ Mathematics	6	3.2%	4	4.0%	- 2	-33.3%
▸ Computer Info Science	13	6.8%	10	10.0%	- 3	-23.1%
▸ PE/Recreation	34	17.9%	27	27.0%	- 7	-20.6%
▸ Geology*	2	1.1%	6	6.0%	+ 4	+ 300.0%
▸ Forestry*	-	-	3	3.0%	+ 3	+ 300.0%
▸ Medical Technology*	-	-	3	3.0%	+ 3	+ 300.0%

*Not in Fall '92 Top Ten
**Not in Spring '93 Top 10

COSUMNES RIVER COLLEGE/PLACERVILLE CENTER
ALL STUDENTS—SPRING 92 AND SPRING 93

Demographics & Other Characteristics		%		Number		Net Change		
		Spring 92	Spring 93	Spring 92	Spring 93	% Pts	Number	% Chg
TOTAL STUDENTS		100.0	100.0	2,115	1,807	0.0	-308	-14.6
GENDER	Women	64.8	64.9	1,370	1,173	0.1	-197	-14.4
	Men	35.2	35.1	743	634	-0.1	-109	-14.7
	Unknown			2	0		-2	
ETHNICITY	African American	0.3	0.3	6	6	0.0	0	0.0
	American Indian	2.2	3.2	46	58	1.0	12	26.1
	Asian	0.8	0.7	16	12	-0.1	-4	-25.0
	Caucasian	88.3	86.6	1,868	1,564	-1.7	-304	-16.3
	Filipino	0.4	0.6	9	10	0.2	1	11.1
	Latino	5.3	5.2	112	93	-0.1	-19	-17.0
	Other	1.8	2.2	37	39	0.4	2	5.4
	Unknown (No Code)	1.0	1.4	21	25	0.4	4	19.1
AGE GROUP	Under 18	3.6	5.5	77	99	1.9	22	28.6
	18 to 20	18.1	20.4	383	369	2.3	-14	-3.7
	21 to 24	11.3	12.8	238	231	1.5	-7	-2.9
	25 to 29	10.7	10.2	227	184	-0.5	-43	-18.9
	30 to 39	25.3	24.3	535	439	-1.0	-96	-17.9
	40 or older	31.0	26.8	655	485	-4.2	-170	-26.0
	30 or older	56.3	51.1	1,190	924	-5.2	-266	-22.4
DAY EVENING	Both Day/Evening	17.8	20.1	377	363	2.3	-14	-3.7
	Day only	29.8	36.7	630	663	6.9	33	5.2
	Evening only	52.4	43.2	1,108	781	-9.2	-327	-29.5
UNIT LOAD	Full time (12+)	10.4	14.1	220	254	3.7	34	15.5
	Mid (6-11.5)	24.9	25.7	526	464	0.8	-62	-11.8
	Light (.5-5.5)	64.7	60.3	1,369	1,089	-4.4	-280	-20.5
	Average number/units			5.19	5.59		+.40	
EDUCATIONAL GOAL	Transfer/no AA	12.9	10.8	272	195	-2.1	-77	-28.3
	Transfer/with AA	27.1	27.9	572	504	0.8	-68	-11.9
	Vocational AA	4.5	3.9	94	70	-0.6	-24	-25.5
	General Education AA	3.3	2.7	69	49	-0.6	-20	-29.0
	Vocational Certificate	3.3	2.8	70	50	-0.5	-20	-28.6
	Acquire Job Skill	7.2	4.3	153	77	-2.9	-76	-49.7
	Upgrade Job Skill	12.2	8.0	258	145	-4.2	-113	-43.8
	No AA/certificate goal	29.6	39.7	624	717	10.1	93	14.9
ENROLLMENT STATUS	New, never attended	13.1	14.9	277	269	1.8	-8	-2.9
	New, attended 2 yr	8.4	8.4	177	151	0.0	-26	-14.7
	New, attended 4 yr	5.6	3.0	118	55	-2.6	-63	-53.4
	Returning (prev. LR)	21.8	16.7	460	302	-5.1	-158	-34.4
	Returning (@ 2 yr)	3.2	2.5	67	45	-0.7	-22	-32.8
	Returning (@ 4 yr)	2.9	0.9	62	16	-2.0	-46	-74.2
	High School Student	1.8	1.7	38	30	-0.1	-8	-21.1
	Continuing	43.3	52.0	915	939	8.7	24	2.6

TABLEVALLSS.PVL

COSUMNES RIVER COLLEGE/PLACERVILLE CENTER
BA+ STUDENTS—SPRING 92 AND SPRING 93

Demographics & Other Characteristics		%		Number		Net Change		
		Spring 92	Spring 93	Spring 92	Spring 93	% Pts	Number	% Chg
TOTAL STUDENTS		100.0	100.0	257	85	0.0	-172	-66.9
GENDER	Women	58.0	61.2	149	52	3.2	-97	-65.1
	Men	42.0	38.8	108	33	-3.2	-75	-69.4
	Unknown			0	0		0	
ETHNICITY	African American	0.4	0.0	1	0	-0.4	-1	-100.0
	American Indian	1.6	2.4	4	2	0.8	-2	-50.0
	Asian	0.0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0	
	Caucasian	92.6	85.9	238	73	-6.7	-165	-69.3
	Filipino	0.0	2.4	0	2	2.4	2	
	Latino	2.7	4.7	7	4	2.0	-3	-42.9
	Other	2.7	2.4	7	2	-0.3	-5	-71.4
	Unknown (No Code)	0.0	2.4	0	2	2.4	2	
AGE GROUP	Under 18	0.0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0	
	18 to 20	0.0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0	
	21 to 24	0.8	3.5	2	3	2.7	1	50.0
	25 to 29	6.6	4.7	17	4	-1.9	-13	-76.5
	30 to 39	29.2	28.2	75	24	-1.0	-51	-68.0
	40 or older	63.4	63.5	163	54	0.1	-109	-66.9
	30 or older	92.6	91.7	238	78	-0.9	-160	-67.2
DAY EVENING	Both Day/Evening	5.1	5.9	13	5	0.8	-8	-61.5
	Day only	19.8	27.1	51	23	7.3	-28	-54.9
	Evening only	75.1	67.1	193	57	-8.0	-136	-70.5
UNIT LOAD	Full time (12+)	0.0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0	
	Mid (6-11.5)	9.3	4.7	24	4	-4.6	-20	-83.3
	Light (.5-5.5)	90.7	95.3	233	81	4.6	-152	-65.2
	Average number/units			2.91	2.70		-.21	
EDUCATIONAL GOAL	Transfer/no AA	3.1	2.4	8	2	-0.7	-6	-75.0
	Transfer/with AA	0.8	4.7	2	4	3.9	2	100.0
	Vocational AA	0.4	1.2	1	1	0.8	0	0.0
	General Education AA	0.4	0.0	1	0	-0.4	-1	-100.0
	Vocational Certificate	1.6	1.2	4	1	-0.4	-3	-75.0
	Acquire Job Skill	10.9	8.2	28	7	-2.7	-21	-75.0
	Upgrade Job Skill	24.9	10.6	64	9	-14.3	-55	-85.9
	No AA/certificate goal	58.0	71.8	149	61	13.8	-88	-59.1
ENROLLMENT STATUS	New, never attended	0.8	1.2	2	1	0.4	-1	-50.0
	New, attended 2 yr	0.0	1.2	0	1	1.2	1	
	New, attended 4 yr	30.0	32.9	77	28	2.9	-49	-63.6
	Returning (prev. LR)	24.5	21.2	63	18	-3.3	-45	-71.4
	Returning (@ 2 yr)	0.0	1.2	0	1	1.2	1	
	Returning (@ 4 yr)	14.0	7.1	36	6	-6.9	-30	-83.3
	High School Student	0.0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0	
	Continuing	30.7	35.3	79	30	4.6	-49	-62.0

TABLE/BASS.PVL

APPENDIX

Sacramento City College

Questionnaire and Responses to BA+ Student Survey—Fall 1992

Highlights of BA+ Student Survey (Fall 1992)

Comparison of College BA+ Students' Course-Taking Patterns (Fall 1992-Spring 1993)

Chart of All Student Characteristics—Spring 1992 & Spring 1993

Chart of BA+ Student Characteristics—Spring 1992 & Spring 1993

LOS RIOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

SURVEY OF BACCALAUREATE DEGREE STUDENTS

SACRAMENTO CITY COLLEGE FIGURES
(N = 500)

AMERICAN RIVER COLLEGE

COSUMNES RIVER COLLEGE
CRC/PLACERVILLE CENTER

SACRAMENTO CITY COLLEGE

DEAR STUDENT: Your answers to the following questions will help us to schedule courses to meet your needs. (Unless otherwise noted, please check only one response for each item.)

1. What is your MOST IMPORTANT reason for attending our college? (Check only one.)

178	36%	a. To acquire skills for new job/career
72	14%	b. To upgrade skills for present career field
14	3%	c. To maintain certificate or license
5	1%	d. To improve basic skills in English/reading/math
57	11%	e. To earn transferable units for another degree
151	30%	f. For personal interest/educational development
18	4%	g. Other (please describe) (Various)
5	1%	No Response

2. Are you enrolled in an occupational major program?

Yes 116 23% No 368 74% NR 16 3%

If Yes, which program? (Check only one.)
(% based on 116 who answered Yes)

21	18%	a. Accounting/Business/Management
2	2%	b. Administration of Justice
4	3%	c. Aviation Maintenance Technology
6	5%	d. Computer Information Science
7	6%	e. Early Childhood Education
2	2%	f. Electronics Technology
0	0%	g. Fire Technology
0	0%	h. Food Service Management
0	0%	i. Foodservice Production/Control
0	0%	j. Horticulture
0	0%	k. Legal Assisting
5	4%	l. Library Technology
4	3%	m. Mechanical-Electrical Technology
15	13%	n. Nursing (R.N.)
13	11%	o. Occupational Therapy Assistant
4	3%	p. Printing Technology
4	3%	q. Real Estate
7	6%	r. Sign Language Studies
19	16%	s. Other (please specify) (Various)
3	3%	Answered Yes but did not specify program

3. In what other types of courses are you enrolled? (Check all that apply.) (Each % based on 500)

52	10%	a. Art
44	9%	b. Biological Sciences (biology, physiology, etc.)
48	10%	c. Business/Computer Science/Management
11	2%	d. Early Childhood Education
18	4%	e. English/Speech
7	1%	f. English as a Second Language
19	4%	g. Family/Consumer Science, Home Economics
60	12%	h. Foreign Language
26	5%	i. Mathematics/Statistics
29	6%	j. Music
41	8%	k. Physical Education
24	5%	l. Physical Sciences (chemistry, physics, etc.)
46	9%	m. Social/Behavioral Science (econ., psych., etc.)
3	1%	n. Theater Arts
38	8%	o. Other (Please specify) (Various)

4. What is your current employment status?

282	56%	a. Employed full-time
97	19%	b. Employed part-time
0	0%	c. Full-time military service
54	11%	d. Unemployed but seeking work
60	12%	e. Unemployed, not seeking work
7	1%	No Response

5. How many units are you taking this semester?

23	5%	a. 12 or more units
121	24%	b. 6 to 11.5 units
351	70%	c. .5 to 5.5 units
5	1%	No Response

6. When are your classes scheduled?

60	12%	a. During the day (mornings and afternoons)
41	8%	b. Mornings only (begin before 12:00)
38	8%	c. Afternoons only (begin 12:00 or later)
302	60%	d. Evenings only (begin 5:00 p.m. or later)
43	9%	e. Both day and evening
11	2%	f. Weekends (only)
5	1%	No Response

[OVER, PLEASE]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

7. Where do you attend classes? (Check all that apply)
(Each % based on 500 respondents)

22	4%	a. AMERICAN RIVER COLLEGE (Main Campus)
0	0%	b. Natomas Outreach Center
0	0%	c. Sunrise Outreach Center
0	0%	d. McClellan AFB Outreach Center
0	0%	e. Kaiser Hospital
0	0%	f. Gramercy Court
0	0%	g. Sacramento Fire Dept. Towers
0	0%	h. Mission Oaks Senior Center
0	0%	i. Orange Grove School
12	2%	j. COSUMNES RIVER COLLEGE (Main)
2	.4%	k. Placerville Center
0	0%	l. Folsom/Cordova Outreach Sites
0	0%	m. Mather Outreach Center
364	73%	n. SACRAMENTO CITY COLLEGE (Main)
64	13%	o. Davis Center
71	14%	p. Downtown Center
25	5%	q. West Sacramento Center

8. Please indicate the type of college/university which granted your bachelor's degree:

113	23%	a. University of California
229	46%	b. California State University
20	4%	c. California Independent University
78	16%	d. Out-of-state Public University
51	10%	e. Out-of-state Private University
9	2%	No Response

9. Are your educational expenses offset or reimbursed by your employer?

19	4%	a. Fully paid for/reimbursed
23	5%	b. Partially paid for/reimbursed
341	68%	c. No financial assistance from employer
108	22%	d. Not applicable/not employed
9	2%	No Response

10. Please indicate the approximate total annual income of your household:

22	4%	a. $ 4,999 or less	54	11%	f. $25-$29,999
30	6%	b. $ 5,000-$ 9,999	50	10%	g. $30-$34,999
48	10%	c. $10,000-$14,999	26	5%	h. $35-$39,999
48	10%	d. $15,000-$19,999	143	29%	i. $40,000+
59	12%	e. $20,000-$24,999	20	4%	No Response

11. Students who may be exempt from the new $40 differential fee are described on the enclosed sheet. PLEASE READ THESE DESCRIPTIONS CAREFULLY and indicate if you think you qualify for and plan to apply for one of the exemptions:

26	5%	a. Dislocated worker
7	1%	b. Displaced homemaker
16	3%	c. Student on public assistance (AFDC, SSI, etc.)
8	2%	d. Student paying nonresident tuition
443	89%	No Response

12. Do you plan to reenroll at one of our colleges next semester (Spring 1993)? (18 = 4% No Response)

233 47% Yes If Yes, for how many units? Avg. = 5

249 50% No If No, please indicate why: (% based on 249)

11	4%	a. My educational objective will be completed.
181	73%	b. New fees will make college too expensive.
6	2%	c. Plan to "stop out" and reenroll at a later time.
15	6%	d. Will enroll at another school: (% based on 15)
		3 (20%) University of California campus
		10 (67%) California State University campus
		1 (7%) California Independent University
		0 (0%) Public out-of-state university
		0 (0%) Private out-of-state university
		0 (0%) Another California community college
		1 (7%) Other (please specify) (Various)
30	12%	e. Other reasons: (Various)
6	2%	Answered No but did not give reason.

COMMENTS: [If you have any additional comments, add them here.]

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS SURVEY!

[Please return this form in the postage-paid envelope as soon as possible.]

LOS RIOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

SACRAMENTO CITY COLLEGE AMERICAN RIVER COLLEGE COSUMNES RIVER COLLEGE

Sacramento City College
Baccalaureate Student Survey Highlights

The district has just completed a special survey of the 4,009 baccalaureate degree students enrolled districtwide in Fall 1992 (about 8% of our student population). The overall response rate for Sacramento City College students was 35%, and the SCC respondent population did vary from the survey population with somewhat more women, older and white students among the respondents. In terms of demographics, 73% of respondents were over 30 years old, 66% were women, and 29% were ethnic minorities.

This survey addressed the baccalaureate students' goals and background, and the potential effect of the new $40-per-unit differential fee on their educational plans. Initial findings of the survey for SCC include the following:

- More than half (53%) of the baccalaureate students are attending for job-related reasons; 11% are earning transfer units toward a different degree; and 30% are enrolled for personal development.
- More than half (56%) are employed full-time and 19% part-time.
- Surprisingly, 11% are unemployed and seeking work, somewhat higher than the unemployment percentage statewide or in the Sacramento region.
- Seventy percent are taking fewer than 6 units, and 60% are attending only during the evenings.
- Almost half (46%) of these students received their baccalaureate degrees from the CSU system and 23% from the UC system. Almost a third (30%) received their degrees from either independent (private) or out-of-state institutions.
- Two out of three (68%) said their employer provided no financial assistance toward their educational expenses, and only 9% were partially or fully reimbursed.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1919 SPANOS COURT • SACRAMENTO, CA 95825-3981 • 916-568-3021

- In terms of annual household income, 30% of the baccalaureate students reported less than $20,000; in fact, 10% had an annual income of under $10,000. Almost 38% reported between $20,000 and $40,000, and 29% $40,000 or more.

- Relatively few (11%) of the students believed they might be eligible for one of the fee exemption categories (5% as dislocated workers, 3% on public assistance, 1% as displaced homemakers, and 2% already paying nonresident tuition).

- Half of the students (50%) stated they would not return to one of the Los Rios colleges next semester, the great majority (73%) because they felt the new fees would make college too expensive.

Additional analyses of the survey information have been completed, and results by district and college are available upon request. A previous analysis of the baccalaureate students' course-taking patterns and demographics was produced by the district's Office of Planning and Research and is available both by district and by college.

Los Rios Community College District
Office of Planning and Research
November 16, 1992

COMPARISON OF BA+ STUDENTS' COURSE-TAKING PATTERNS
Fall 1992-Spring 1993

SACRAMENTO CITY COLLEGE

The following summary shows the "top ten/eleven" departments in terms of BA+ student enrollments in Fall 1992 and Spring 1993 (percentages are of all BA+ course enrollments). The last two columns show the net "loss" in individual enrollments, followed by the percentage loss compared to the previous semester. Departments are listed in order of percentage loss in enrollments in Spring 1993 compared to Fall 1992.

	Fall 1992		Spring 1993		Loss in Enrollments	% Loss From Fall 1992
TOTALS (all BA+ courses)	**2,392**	**100%**	**1,493**	**100%**	**- 899**	**-37.6%**
▸ Art	135	5.6%	53	3.5%	- 82	-60.7%
▸ Physics	88	3.7%	45	3.0%	- 43	-49.0%
▸ Spanish	118	4.9%	63	4.2%	- 55	-46.6%
▸ Computer Info Science**	78	3.3%	43	2.9%	- 35	-44.9%
▸ PE/Recreation	140	5.9%	84	5.6%	- 56	-40.0%
▸ Psychology	79	3.3%	48	3.2%	- 31	-39.2%
▸ Accounting	100	4.2%	61	4.1%	- 39	-39.0%
▸ Mathematics	85	3.6%	52	3.5%	- 33	-38.9%
▸ Family Consumer Science*	76	3.2%	58	3.9%	- 18	-23.7%
▸ English as a Second Language*	57	2.4%	45	3.0%	- 12	-21.1%
▸ Biology	153	6.4%	124	8.3%	- 29	-19.0%
▸ Chemistry	104	4.3%	92	6.2%	- 12	-11.6%

*Not in Fall '92 Top Ten
**Not in Spring '93 Top 11 (Physics/ESL tied for 10th)

SACRAMENTO CITY COLLEGE
ALL STUDENTS—SPRING 92 AND SPRING 93

Demographics & Other Characteristics		%		Number		Net Change		
		Spring 92	Spring 93	Spring 92	Spring 93	% Pts	Number	% Chg
TOTAL STUDENTS		100.0	100.0	16,496	15,617	0.0	-879	-5.3
GENDER	Women	56.3	56.4	9,292	8,807	0.1	-485	-5.2
	Men	43.7	43.6	7,204	6,810	-0.1	-394	-5.5
	Unknown			0	0		0	
ETHNICITY	African American	12.4	12.1	2,046	1,894	-0.3	-152	-7.4
	American Indian	1.9	1.8	305	286	-0.1	-19	-6.2
	Asian	17.3	17.8	2,858	2,781	0.5	-77	-2.7
	Caucasian	49.0	46.8	8,081	7,301	-2.2	-780	-9.7
	Filipino	2.1	2.2	339	346	0.1	7	2.1
	Latino	12.6	13.4	2,078	2,099	0.8	21	1.0
	Other	4.3	5.6	713	877	1.3	164	23.0
	Unknown (No Code)	0.5	0.2	76	33	-0.3	-43	-56.6
AGE GROUP	Under 18	1.4	1.7	238	257	0.3	19	8.0
	18 to 20	22.5	22.4	3,714	3,495	-0.1	-219	-5.9
	21 to 24	25.4	25.8	4,187	4,036	0.4	-151	-3.6
	25 to 29	17.1	18.0	2,814	2,817	0.9	3	0.1
	30 to 39	20.3	19.5	3,348	3,050	-0.8	-298	-8.9
	40 or older	13.3	12.6	2,195	1,962	-0.7	-233	-10.6
	30 or older	33.6	32.1	5,543	5,012	-1.5	-531	-9.6
DAY EVENING	Both Day/Evening	18.4	19.7	3,029	3,078	1.3	49	1.6
	Day only	51.7	51.8	8,523	8,089	0.1	-434	-5.1
	Evening only	30.0	28.5	4,944	4,450	-1.5	-494	-10.0
UNIT LOAD	Full time (12+)	27.7	28.8	4,565	4,494	1.1	-71	-1.6
	Mid (6-11.5)	33.9	33.6	5,585	5,246	-0.3	-339	-6.1
	Light (.5-5.5)	38.4	37.5	6,320	5,855	-0.9	-465	-7.4
	Average number/units			7.70	7.94		+.24	
EDUCATIONAL GOAL	Transfer/no AA	20.9	19.0	3,444	2,963	-1.9	-481	-14.0
	Transfer/with AA	41.6	38.3	6,863	5,983	-3.3	-880	-12.8
	Vocational AA	6.0	5.5	986	853	-0.5	-133	-13.5
	General Education AA	3.8	2.6	629	407	-1.2	-222	-35.3
	Vocational Certificate	4.4	4.0	721	626	-0.4	-95	-13.2
	Acquire Job Skill	3.7	2.6	607	400	-1.1	-207	-34.1
	Upgrade Job Skill	7.2	4.4	1,183	682	-2.8	-501	-42.4
	No AA/certificate goal	12.5	23.7	2,063	3,703	11.2	1,640	79.5
ENROLLMENT STATUS	New, never attended	7.6	8.8	1,249	1,379	1.2	130	10.4
	New, attended 2 yr	5.4	6.4	887	1,006	1.0	119	13.4
	New, attended 4 yr	5.2	4.4	851	680	-0.8	-171	-20.1
	Returning (prev. LR)	11.0	8.6	1,820	1,343	-2.4	-477	-26.2
	Returning (@ 2 yr)	2.7	2.8	439	434	0.1	-5	-1.1
	Returning (@ 4 yr)	3.9	2.7	636	423	-1.2	-213	-33.5
	High School Student	0.7	0.7	118	116	0.0	-2	-1.7
	Continuing	63.6	65.5	10,496	10,236	1.9	-260	-2.5

TABLEALLSS.SCC

SACRAMENTO CITY COLLEGE
BA+ STUDENTS—SPRING 92 AND SPRING 93

Demographics & Other Characteristics		%		Number		Net Change		
		Spring 92	Spring 93	Spring 92	Spring 93	% Pts	Number	% Chg
TOTAL STUDENTS		100.0	100.0	1,544	903	0.0	-641	-41.5
GENDER	Women	58.5	62.1	903	561	3.6	-342	-37.9
	Men	41.5	37.9	641	342	-3.6	-299	-46.7
	Unknown			0	0		0	
ETHNICITY	African American	7.1	5.2	110	47	-1.9	-63	-57.3
	American Indian	1.5	1.0	23	9	-0.5	-14	-60.9
	Asian	13.3	13.3	205	120	0.0	-85	-41.5
	Caucasian	65.4	66.7	1,009	602	1.3	-407	-40.3
	Filipino	1.8	2.6	28	23	0.8	-5	-17.9
	Latino	6.1	5.1	94	46	-1.0	-48	-51.1
	Other	4.7	6.1	72	55	1.4	-17	-23.6
	Unknown (No Code)	0.2	0.1	3	1	-0.1	-2	-66.7
AGE GROUP	Under 18	0.1	0.0	1	0	-0.1	-1	-100.0
	18 to 20	0.3	0.1	4	1	-0.2	-3	-75.0
	21 to 24	13.4	9.1	207	82	-4.3	-125	-60.4
	25 to 29	21.8	25.1	337	227	3.3	-110	-32.6
	30 to 39	33.6	30.7	518	277	-2.9	-241	-46.5
	40 or older	30.9	35.0	477	316	4.1	-161	-33.8
	30 or older	64.5	65.7	995	593	1.2	-402	-40.4
DAY EVENING	Both Day/Evening	8.9	9.0	138	81	0.1	-57	-41.3
	Day only	34.5	39.5	532	357	5.0	-175	-32.9
	Evening only	56.6	51.5	874	465	-5.1	-409	-46.8
UNIT LOAD	Full time (12+)	3.7	4.1	57	37	0.4	-20	-35.1
	Mid (6-11.5)	22.0	20.5	340	185	-1.5	-155	-45.6
	Light (.5-5.5)	74.3	75.4	1,146	681	1.1	-465	-40.6
	Average number/units			4.33	4.47		+.14	
EDUCATIONAL GOAL	Transfer/no AA	8.9	8.0	138	72	-0.9	-66	-47.8
	Transfer/with AA	6.5	4.4	100	40	-2.1	-60	-60.0
	Vocational AA	3.3	5.4	51	49	2.1	-2	-3.9
	General Education AA	1.2	0.7	19	6	-0.5	-13	-68.4
	Vocational Certificate	5.6	5.4	87	49	-0.2	-38	-43.7
	Acquire Job Skill	8.9	7.6	138	69	-1.3	-69	-50.0
	Upgrade Job Skill	29.0	19.1	447	172	-9.9	-275	-61.5
	No AA/certificate goal	36.5	49.4	564	446	12.9	-118	-20.9
ENROLLMENT STATUS	New, never attended	0.1	0.3	2	3	0.2	1	50.0
	New, attended 2 yr	0.1	1.6	2	14	1.5	12	600.0
	New, attended 4 yr	27.5	21.6	424	195	-5.9	-229	-54.0
	Returning (prev. LR)	12.6	3.8	194	34	-8.8	-160	-82.5
	Returning (@ 2 yr)	0.1	1.2	1	11	1.1	10	1,000.0
	Returning (@ 4 yr)	15.7	16.5	242	149	0.8	-93	-38.4
	High School Student	0.0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0	
	Continuing	44.0	55.0	679	497	11.0	-182	-26.8

TABLE/BASS.SCC